

YOUNG INDIA
1919-1922

YOUNG INDIA

1919-1922

By MAHATMA GANDHI

WITH AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

By C. S. RANGA IYER

798

TAGORE & Co., MADRAS

1922

THE TATA PRINTING
WORKS : MADRAS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES...	xiii
A NOTE ON "YOUNG INDIA "	xv
INTRODUCTION ...	xviii
BY C. S RANGA IYER.	
INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE ...	1
I. SATYAGRAHA MOVEMENT.	
Satyagraha Movement . . .	5
Some Proofs of the Universality of Satyagraha ...	40
" Ring out the Old, Ring in the New " ..	43
The ' Leader' Mislead . . .	46
The 6th of April and the 13th . . .	49
Reflections on Satyagraha Week . . .	52
Violence vs. Non-violence . . .	54
Contempt of Court . . .	57
Satyagraha Week	59
Pure Civil Disobedience . . .	63
Durgadas Adwani . . .	65
The Satyagrahi Lawyers . . .	67
II. THE PUNJAB WRONGS.	
The Scope of the Hunter Committee . . .	69
Disseimblence or Negligence . . .	74
By Way of Contrast . . .	72
Political Freemasonry . . .	76
The Punjab Non-official Report ..	81
The Punjab Sentences . . .	83
How the Viceroy Discharges his Trust . . .	85
" It was a Frontier Province " ...	90
Brave Lala Lab Singh . . .	92
The Kasur Incident . . .	94

II. THE PUNJAB WRONGS.—(Contd.)		PAGE
General Dyer	.	96
Jallianwalla Bagh ..	.	98
A Punjab Victim		102
A Hard Case ..	.	103
A Superintendent's Order		105
Another Martial Law Case from the Punjab	.	108
Amritsar Appeals	..	110
A Career of Hatred and Repression ..	.	113
What about General Dyer ?		114
The Duty of the Punjabee		116
Mr. Pennington's Objections Answered	.	120
Mr. Pennington's Letter	.	120
A Running Sore		126
III. THE KHILAFAT.		
The Khilafat	..	130
The Turkish Question	..	132
The Question of Questions	.	135
Why I have joined the Khilafat Movement	.	139
Khilafat	..	143
Some Questions Answered	..	148
Further Questions Answered	...	153
Mr. Candler's Open Letter	.	160
Appeal to the Viceroy	.	165
Hijarat and its Meaning	.	169
Mr. Andrews' Difficulty	..	172
The Turkish Question	...	174
The Meaning of the Khilafat	...	177
The Khilafat Question	...	183
Do	..	193
In Process of Keeping	..	199
San Remo Conference	..	200
Khilafat and Non-violence	.	202
Mr. Gandhi's Khilafat Speech..	.	205
The New Stage	..	210
Mr. Gandhi's Message to the Khilafat Deputation	..	211

CONTENTS

iii

III. THE KHILAFAT --(<i>Contd.</i>)	PAGE
The Premier's Reply . . .	214
Khilafat Appeal . . .	217
Criticism of the Muslim Manifesto . . .	220
The Mussalman Representation . . .	224
British Imperialism . . .	227
The Mahomedan Decision . . .	231
Mr. Montagu on the Khilafat Agitation . . .	233
The Khilafat . . .	237
IV. NON-CO-OPERATION.	
The First of August . . .	241
Letter to the Viceroy . . .	243
Non-co-operation . . .	245
How to work Non-co-operation . . .	247
Non co-operation Committee . . .	251
Mr. Gandhi's Speech . . .	256
At the Call of the Country . . .	259
The Congress . . .	263
Mr. Gandhi's Congress Speech . . .	267
The Sin of Secrecy . . .	275
Mr. Gandhi's Calcutta Speech . . .	279
'In the Throes of a New Birth' . . .	287
To Every Englishman in India . . .	301
A Rejoinder . . .	305
Poply and Phillips' Letter . . .	305
A Civilian Replies . . .	311
Mr. Gandhi's Reply . . .	313
The Congress and Non-co-operation . . .	317
Crusade against Non-co-operation . . .	319
Religious Authority for Non-co-operation.. . .	321
The Duty of Men of Religion . . .	325
More Objections Answered . . .	327
An Advice . . .	330
Some Doubts . . .	332
A Gospel of Hate . . .	334
One Step Enough for Me . . .	337

IV. NON-CO-OPERATION.—(<i>Contd.</i>)		PAGE
Did Jesus Co-operate?	340
Inwardness of N. C. O.	. . .	342
Miss Annie Marie Peterson's Letter	. . .	343
The Poet's Anxiety	. . .	347
Divide and Rule	. . .	352
In Defence of Malaviyaji and Shastriar	357
Ridicule Replacing Repression	360
The Viceroyal Pronouncement.	362
Non-co-operation Explained	364
A Talk with Mr. Gandhi	364
The Mists	370
Gandhi Old and New	. . .	374
To the Moderates	377
Dr. Pollen on the Warpath	. . .	382
To Every Englishman in India II	386
V. NON-CO-OPERATION PROGRAMME.		
When and How to Act	. . .	390
(i) BOYCOTT OF REFORMED COUNCILS—		
The Royal Proclamation	392
A Humble Suggestion	. . .	395
What should the Voters do	. . .	397
Non-co-operation and Councils	400
Councils' Boycott	. . .	402
Council Elections	. . .	405
(ii) BOYCOTT OF LAW COURTS—		
Duty of Lawyers	407
The Hallucination of Law Courts	410
Practising Lawyers	414
How Many Lawyers and Students Help	415
Cobblers vs. Lawyers	417
Practising Lawyers	. . .	418
About Lawyers	. . .	420
(iii) BOYCOTT OF SCHOOLS AND NATIONAL EDUCATION—		
Boycott of Schools	422
The Hallucination of Schools and Colleges	425

CONTENTS

v

V. N -C.-O. PROGRAMME.—(<i>Contd.</i>)	PAGE
Aligarh . . .	427
To the Trustees of Aligarh College ..	430
To the Parents of Aligarh Boys ..	433
To Young Bengal ..	436
Sitting ' Dhurna ' ..	437
The Student Movement in Calcutta ..	440
The Duty of Students ..	441
Education and Non-co-operation ..	447
A Parent's Duty	449
National Education ..	451
National University of Gujarat ..	455
The Cause of the Vernaculars ..	458
A Lesson from the French Renaissance ..	465
Foreigners in their own Country ..	467
An Appeal to Madras ..	469
Hindi as a Common Language ..	472
Hindustani in the Congress ..	473
Need for Hindustani ..	474
An Unmitigated Evil ..	477
✓ English Education ..	479
English Learning ..	481
(iv) SWADESHI—	
Swaraj in Swadeshi ..	484
Swadeshi ..	487
Some <i>i/s</i> ..	489
The Uses of Khaddar ..	490
The Music of the Spinning Wheel ..	494
Swadeshi ..	497
Mill made Khadi ..	498
Fraudulent Imitations ..	499
Khilafat and Swadeshi ..	500
The Secret of Swaraj ..	502
The Duty of Spinning ..	507
The Potency of the Spinning Wheel ..	509
Hand Spinning Again ..	510
Famine Insurance ..	513

V. N.-C.-O. PROGRAMME —(Contd.)	PAGE
Hand Spinning and Hand Weaving	.. 515
Famine Relief	.. 519
Greater Use of Hand Looms	. 521
The Message of the Charka	. 524
A Confession of Error	.. 527
Wanted Experts	531
Co-operation	534
Indian Economics	.. 535
The Cloth Problem	. 541
Hand Looms or Power Mills	. 543
Mill Cloth	. 546
(v) BOYCOTT—	
Is Boycott Swadeshi	. 549
Boycott of Goods vs N C. O Programme	553
How to Boycott Foreign Cloth	.. 555
Why Burn?	.. 555
Burning in Bombay	.. 558
Ethics of Destruction	.. 563
Essentials of Success	. 569
To the Women of India	. 571
The Poor Man's Way	.. 575
30th September	.. 577
(vi) HINDU MUSLIM UNITY—	
Hindu-Muslim Unity	. 580
Hindu-Muslim Unity	.. 582
Hindu-Muslim Unity	.. 585
Hindu-Muslim Unity a Camouflage	. 589
Hindu Mahomedan Unity	.. 593
Cow Protection	. 527
Save the Cow	. 600
The Way to Save the Cow	.. 603
Let Hindus Beware	.. 605
(vii) NATIONAL UNITY—	
Brahmins and Non-Brahmins	.. 608
The Caste System	... 613
Prejudice and Insolence 614

V. N.-C.-O PROGRAMME.—(<i>Contd</i>)	PAGE
Caste vs Class	617
To the Parsis	620
Satyagraha in Mulshi	621
What Should the Parsis do . . .	624
Christians and Non-co-operation ...	626
The National Flag	628
The Sikh Colour	929
Three National Cries	632
(viii) UNTOUCHABILITY—	
The Sin of Untouchability . . .	634
The Panchamas	635
Depressed Classes	638
Satyagraha and the Depressed Classes .	638
Mr Genuhi and the Suppressed Classes ..	643
More Difficulties	653
Disappearing Untouchability . .	655
(ix) PEACE CELEBRATIONS—	
Peace Celebrations	656
Peace Celebrations	661
Can We Honestly Rejoice	656
Anti-Celebrations Campaign .. .	663
(x) THE ROYAL VISIT—	
The Prince	669
Who is Disloyal ?	672
What is in a Name ?	673
Ministerial Subterfuge	674
The Duke's Visit	677
To H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught ..	679
Honour the Prince	681
The Prince's Proposed Visit .. .	682
Good and Bad	685
A Deep Stain	684
Appeal to Bombay Citizens	694
An Appeal to the Mavalis	697
To Co-workers	699
The Fast Broken	704
The Moral Issue	706

VI. N. C. O. CAMPAIGN.	PAGE
The Doctrine of the Sword . . .	710
The Greatest Thing . . .	715
Non-violence . . .	717
The Need for Humility . . .	722
Abusing the Khaddar . . .	723
A Triumph of Non-violence ..	724
Assassination of a Deputy Commissioner ...	731
Lucknow Speeches ...	734
The Sikh League ...	738
Necessity of Discipline ..	740
Our Late Tour . . .	744
Hooliganism ..	747
Rowdyism ...	750
Difficulties in Our Way . . .	752
If I am Arrested— . . .	756
Democracy vs. Mobocracy . . .	759
Some Illustrations ..	767
Instructions to the Peasants of the United Provinces.	770
Zamindars and Ryots . . .	771
Social Boycott ..	773
Social Boycott . . .	775
A Set Back . . .	778
Malegaon Misbehaviour . . .	780
Demonstrations . . .	781
Our Shortcomings ...	782
Prison Life ..	787
A Model Prisoner . . .	793
The Simla Visit ..	796
Swaraj is Self-Reliance . . .	796
The Brothers' Apology . . .	802
The Viceroy Speaks . . .	804
That Apology . . .	809
An Ounce of Action ..	813
The Apology Again ...	816
Mr. Pal Again ..	817
The Agreed Statement ...	821

CONTENTS

ix

N. C. O. CAMPAIGN.—(<i>Contd.</i>)	PAGE
Our Burden 	826
Unacceptable 	827
Noble Repentance and its Lesson 	829
Fishing for Apologies 	831
From Ridicule to— 	833
The Viceroy's Two Speeches 	835
Insanity 	839
Repression in the Punjab 	843
Treatment of Prisoners 	847
How to See Zafar Ali Khan 	851
Repression in Behar 	852
Repression Galore 	856
Duty of Non-Co-operators 	856
The Gateway of Freedom 	857
May We Defend 	857
Telegraphic Embargo 	859
The Bihar Government 	861
Repression and its Lesson 	864
Repression in the C. P. 	868
Afflicted Sindh 	870
A Venomous Prosecution 	875
A Mock Trial 	879
Bad of Karachi 	879
Another Gurkha Charge 	883
The Afghan Bogey 	887
A String of Questions 	887
Our Neighbours 	891
The Frontier Friends 	894
The Afghan Alarm 	897
Men, Money and Munitions 	901
All-India Tilak Swaraj Fund 	902
The Need of the Hour 	906
The Destructive Part 	909
The Tilak Memorial Fund 	912
The Beginning of Responsibility 	915
Our Burden 	916

VII. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

Civil Disobedience	.	919
The Ali Brothers	.	922
The Last Act ?	...	924
To the Mussalmans of India	.	929
A Manifesto	...	934
Expression of Opinion	..	934
The All-India Congress Committee	...	937
The Momentous Issue	.	939
Deshabandu Das	...	942
Round Table Conference	..	949
The Proposed Conference	.	952
The Viceroy's Reply	.	957
The Malaviya Conference	.	960
Poles Asunder	.	969
The Immediate Issue	.	973
Non-Payment of Taxes	..	975
Bardoli's Decision	...	981
The Only Issue	.	985
In a Tangle	...	98
Awakening in Andra-Desha	.	992
Danger of Mass-movement	..	999
A Warning Voice from Bengal	...	1001
Caution about Civil Disobedience	.	1002
The Crime of Chauri Chaura	.	1006
I Have Lost All Credit	..	1011
The All-India Congress Committee	.	1022
Needless Nervousness	..	1029
If I Am Arrested	..	1036
The Great Sentinel	..	1041
The Charka in the Gita	...	1047
The Fear of Death	..	1050
The Meaning of the Moplah Rising	...	1053
Hindus and Moplahs	..	1057
A Taxing Examiner	..	1062
Neither a Saint nor a Politician	...	1068
Hinduism

CONTENTS

xi

VII.	CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.—(<i>Contd.</i>)	PAGE
	Position of Women
	Our Fallen Sisters
	Plague Spots of Lucknow

VIII. SWARAJ.

	Swaraj in One Year . . .	1089
	Swaraj in Nine Months . . .	1094
	On the Wrong Track . . .	1098
	" Hind Swaraj " or the Indian Home Rule . . .	1101
	The Conditions of Swaraj .. .	1104
	The Old Story . . .	1107
	A Crop of Difficulties . . .	1110
	Independence .. .	1113

IX. THE CONGRESS.

	The National Week . . .	1118
	The Congress . . .	1123
	The Congress Constitution . . .	1130
	The Congress Constitution .. .	1134
	The British Congress Committee and " India " .. .	1138
	do. .. .	1140
	The Working Committee and its Function .. .	1142
	Foreign Propoganda . . .	1146
	Congress a Fetish . . .	1152
	Lokamanya . . .	1154
	The Good Samaritan . . .	1156
	The Malaviyas . . .	1158
	A Confession of Faith	1160
	Some Misconceptions	1165

THE GREAT TRIAL 1170

	Mr. Gandhi's Oral Statement	1175
	Mr. Gandhi's Written Statement . . .	1177
	The Judgment . . .	1183
	Mr. Gandhi's Reply .. .	1184

THE GREAT TRIAL.—(<i>Contd</i>)		PAGE
Appendix.		
(a) Tampering with Loyalty 1185
(b) A Puzzle and its Solution 1187
(c) Shaking the Manes 1189

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on October 5, 1869. Caste, Bania; Son of Karamchand Gandhi, Dewan of Porebunder, Rajkote and some other Kathiawar States; He was educated at the Kathiawad High School, later at London University and the Inner Temple. On return from London was enrolled as advocate of the Bombay High Court. Went to Natal and thence to the Transvaal on a legal mission. Was enrolled as Advocate of the Natal Supreme Court. Decided to remain there. Founded the Natal Indian Congress, 1894. Returned to India, 1895. Agitation in India on behalf of the Natal and Transvaal Indians. Returned to Durban. On landing attacked by the mob and narrowly escaped death; led an Indian Ambulance Corps in the Anglo-Boer war, 1899; Returned to India in 1901 to recoup his health. Again returned to S. Africa to lead the Indian deputation to place the Indian view of the South African Indian trouble before Mr. Chamberlain. Enrolled as attorney of the Supreme Court of Transvaal and founded the Transvaal British Indian Association and was its Hon. Secretary and principal legal adviser. Founded the *Indian Opinion* in 1903; and the Phoenix Settlement. Led a Stretcher Bearer Corps in the native rebellion in 1906; Agitation against the Anti-Asiatic Act, 1906; Deputation to England for the repeal of the Act; Passive Resistance movement begun against the Act; Negotiations between General Smuts and

Gandhi and compromise. Smuts later denying the promise of repeal of the law, again commenced passive resistance. Imprisoned twice for breaking the law. Again went to England in 1909 to lay the Indian case before the British public ; Provisional settlement in 1911 ; Mr. Gokhale's visit to South Africa. On the Government declining to fulfill the settlement of 1911, organised a revival of the passive resistance movement. Final settlement in 1914 ; Visit to England ; raised an Indian Ambulance Corps in 1914 ; Returned to India, 1915 ; Founded the Satyagrahashram at Ahmedabad ; Took part in the settlement of the Champaran labour troubles in 1917 and Kaira famine and Ahmedabad mill strike, 1918 ; Recruiting campaign 1918 ; Agitation against the Rowlatt Act and the inauguration of the Satyagraha movement, 1919 ; Arrested at Kosi on his way Delhi and sent back to Bombay ; Punjab disorders and the official atrocities, 1919 ; Was member of the Congress Committee of Enquiry into the Punjab atrocities ; Took part in the Khilafat Agitation. Inauguration of the Non-co-operation campaign, 1920 ; Interview with Lord Reading May, 1921 ; appointed sole executive authority of the Congress in 1921 session of the Congress ; Civil Disobedience programme, February 1922 ; Suspension of Civil Disobedience campaign on account of Chauri Chaura riots, February 1922 ; Arrested on March 10, 1922, tried and sentenced to six years simple imprisonment.

“YOUNG INDIA”

Founded by Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas of Bombay; Subsequently passed into the hands of a syndicate of which Mr. Shankarlal Bunker was a member; After the deportation of Mr. Horniman of the *Bombay Chronicle*, which was at the same time put under censorship, Mr. Gandhi assumed charge of *Young India*; When censorship was removed and *Chronicle* was able to write independently, *Young India* was removed to Ahmedabad.) (See Introductory Article.)

INTRODUCTION

The movement of Non-co-operation has been criticised by its Indian and non-Indian adversaries as a product of impatient idealism, impetuosity and unreason or a development of philosophic anarchism making for ultimate paralysis of society itself. The leaders of the movement have been variously criticised and Mahatma Gandhi himself is spoken of as having captured the Mussalmans and the Congress to serve his own Tolstoyan ends. The Congress of to-day has been represented as having nothing in it of the spirit of its founders and drifted into unchartered seas with no definite future before it.

It is not my purpose to take up one by one the criticisms that have been levelled against the Congress and its leaders or the movement of Non-co-operation. The Civil Disobedience Committee Report has, however, answered the charge levelled against the door of the Congress in the narrative portion of the Non-co-operation movement.

A LOOK BACK

I admit that the Congress of to-day has undergone fundamental changes in programme, policy and outlook, perhaps, beyond the recognition of its originators. I also admit that the present leaders of the Congress and its rank and file do not have that remarkable faith in British justice and fair-play which inspired its great founders. The change that has come over the country with the last

forty years is colossal and it is my opinion that the Congress has only moved with the times and performed its principal function of mirroring the thoughts of the majority of the thinking people of India. To understand the change that has come over the country and the institution of the Congress and the attitude of Non-co-operation it has felt constrained to adopt towards existing system of government, a brief and cursory survey of the historical events since the commencement of the British rule is necessary, for I venture to claim from what I have seen all over the country with my own eyes and from what I happen to know from the evidence which the C. D. Committee have collected that the root that Non-co-operation has struck is as deep as British rule itself.

THE COMPANY RULE

I do not propose to examine at length the record of the first English rulers who were also the founders of the English Empire in India, but as the traditions of a Government have a bearing on its growth and the attitude of the people towards it, I may recall one or two observations of eminent Englishmen themselves giving as they do what fair-minded critics thought of their countrymen's performances. (In his impeachment of one of the English rulers of India, Mr. Edmund Burke declared that Lord Warren Hastings had sullied the "ancient honour" of the English nation and "trodden under foot" an old, great and wealthy country which he had "turned into a desert.") Another Englishman who was also a servant, Imperialist and a retired Anglo-Indian, Lord Macaulay, described the achievements of British rule in India in the following terms: "Thirty millions of human beings were

reduced to the extremity of wretchedness. They had been accustomed to live under tyranny but never under tyranny like this. That Government oppressive as the most oppressive form of barbarian despotism was strong with all the strength of civilization." When such were the facts which shocked Englishmen themselves, the feelings of Indians who were most affected could be imagined. Macaulay quotes the words of a Muslim historian, according to whom "the people under their (the English) dominion groan everywhere and are reduced to poverty and distress. O, God, Come to the assistance of thy afflicted servants and deliver them from the oppressions which they suffer."

(The exposure of British rule by critics in England who were ashamed of the doings of their brethren abroad and the resentment they were producing on the oppressed people themselves hastened the evolution of some orderly and sympathetic government. Indian Civil Service though European in character and constitution, was established; a judicial system, however defective and biassed, was adopted; and the administration of the Land Revenue with all its limitations and imperfections was taken up. A sort of artificial peace was secured to save the face of the East India Company, but real contentment which had existed in days gone by was conspicuous only by its absence. Conscious of the deep-seated discontent in the land, the government undertook some beneficent measures, amongst which may be mentioned the opening of Colleges in Calcutta and the grant of liberty to the press (1817-1836). But the heart of the Government remained unchanged. They pursued with a vigour which was equalled only by

forty years is colossal and it is my opinion that the Congress has only moved with the times and performed its principal function of mirroring the thoughts of the majority of the thinking people of India. To understand the change that has come over the country and the institution of the Congress and the attitude of Non-co-operation it has felt constrained to adopt towards existing system of government, a brief and cursory survey of the historical events since the commencement of the British rule is necessary, for I venture to claim from what I have seen all over the country with my own eyes and from what I happen to know from the evidence which the C. D. Committee have collected that the root that Non-co-operation has struck is as deep as British rule itself.

THE COMPANY RULE

I do not propose to examine at length the record of the first English rulers who were also the founders of the English Empire in India, but as the traditions of a Government have a bearing on its growth and the attitude of the people towards it, I may recall one or two observations of eminent Englishmen themselves giving as they do what fair-minded critics thought of their countrymen's performances. In his impeachment of one of the English rulers of India, Mr. Edmund Burke declared that Lord Warren Hastings had sullied the "ancient honour" of the English nation and "trodden under foot" an old, great and wealthy country which he had "turned into a desert." Another Englishman who was also a servant, Imperialist and a retired Anglo-Indian, Lord Macaulay, described the achievements of British rule in India in the following terms: "Thirty millions of human beings were

reduced to the extremity of wretchedness. They had been accustomed to live under tyranny but never under tyranny like this. That Government oppressive as the most oppressive form of barbarian despotism was strong with all the strength of civilization." When such were the facts which shocked Englishmen themselves, the feelings of Indians who were most affected could be imagined. Macaulay quotes the words of a Muslim historian, according to whom "the people under their (the English) dominion groan everywhere and are reduced to poverty and distress. O, God, Come to the assistance of thy afflicted servants and deliver them from the oppressions which they suffer.")

(The exposure of British rule by critics in England who were ashamed of the doings of their brethren abroad and the resentment they were producing on the oppressed people themselves hastened the evolution of some orderly and sympathetic government. Indian Civil Service though European in character and constitution, was established; a judicial system, however defective and biassed, was adopted; and the administration of the Land Revenue with all its limitations and imperfections was taken up. A sort of artificial peace was secured to save the face of the East India Company, but real contentment which had existed in days gone by was conspicuous only by its absence. Conscious of the deep-seated discontent in the land, the government undertook some beneficent measures, amongst which may be mentioned the opening of Colleges in Calcutta and the grant of liberty to the press (1817-1836). But the heart of the Government remained unchanged. They pursued with a vigour which was equalled only by

its callousness their annexation policy. Native State after Native State under one pretext or another was annexed to the British Empire. The annexation of Oudh in 1856 was the last straw to break the camel's back. The leaders, though unorganised and mutually destructive, united in their hatred of the aliens and appealed in sheer despair to the patriotism and prejudice of the Indian soldiery. The response was electric and the result was what English writers call "the Great Indian Mutiny" which according to some Indian critics was really a war of independence from English control.

THE REBELLION OF 1857

In Oudh the rebellion of 1857 was certainly not a mutiny of mere soldiers. The populace took part in it. It was a war of liberation to them. And they had to pay heavy penalty in devastated homes and desolated hearths. "The Guppy flowed red with flood" said a venerable lady who had witnessed the fight.

UNDER THE CROWN

Queen Victoria issued her famous proclamation of 1858 to act as a soothing balm to the bleeding hearts holding forth the hope of equal opportunities for all irrespective of race and creed, assuring the oppressed and down-trodden people that "in their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security and in their gratitude our reward." The usual gulf that yawns between profession and practice rendered the gracious Proclamation nugatory—a fact which was deplored from time to time by far-sighted Englishmen themselves. Mr. Bright put in a nutshell the Indian situation at the time: "All over those vast regions", said he "there are countless millions help-

less and defenceless, deprived of their natural leaders and their ancient chiefs, looking with only some small ray of hope to that omnipresent and irresistible power by which they have been subjected." "Is it possible", he asked, "to touch a cord in the hearts of Englishmen to raise them to a sense of the miseries inflicted on that unhappy country by crimes and blunders of our rulers here. If you have steeled your hearts against the natives, if nothing can stir you to sympathy with their miseries, at least have pity upon your own countrymen". If the general administration was tyrannical and unscrupulous, the financial mismanagement was appalling—so appalling in that Henry Fawcett characterised it as "magnificent meanness". The British Government thought that matters had reached the stage when investigation or at least a show of it, should be made. A Parliamentary Committee was appointed with Fawcett himself as its Chairman to inquire into the financial administration of India. Fawcett's inquiry only served to bring him into close touch with Indians for whose welfare he strove hard in Parliament, but it could not stop that financial extravagance and exploitation inevitably associated with every foreign rule. Fawcett was defeated in one of the general elections. English educated Indians who were the only politically minded people at the time raised a subscription of £ 750 to enable him to get into Parliament at the next earliest possible opportunity which he did, to serve India with redoubled earnestness.

PARLIAMENT'S INDIFFERENCE

Neither the "Indian member" as Fawcett came to be called, nor other friends of India could produce any

impression on Parliament which seemed to pursue the same old course. What Macaulay had said of Parliamentary indifference to India in the Company days was no less true under the Crown :—

“ A broken head in Cold Bath fields produces a greater sensation amongst us than three pitched battles in India. A few weeks ago, we had to decide on a claim brought by an individual against the revenues of India. If it had been an English question the walls would scarcely have held the members who could have flocked to the division. It was an Indian question ; and we could scarcely, by dint of application, make a House. Even my Right Honourable friend, the President of the Board of Control, gave his able and interesting explanation of the plan which he intended to propose for the Government of a hundred million of human beings, the attendance was not so large as I have often seen it on a turn pipe bill or a rail road bill.”

Discontent and poverty were increasing in India. But Parliament would not care.

COERCION OF THE PRESS.

The Government appointed Lord Lytton as the Viceroy as if to complete the ruin of a famine stricken country. Lord Lytton addressed himself to the task of raising “ a scientific frontier ” at immense expense besides conducting useless and expensive expeditions against Afghanistan at the cost of the tax-payer. Lord Lytton's policy was called into question by the public, especially in the Vernacular Press, which was freely expressing the considered opinion

of the country, however unsavoury to the autocracy. Lord Lytton would neither face his critics nor look into their grievances but proceeded to pass a new law whereby he could gag the expression of uncomfortable opinion—a method which his successors have from time to time faithfully copied when placed in similar predicaments. In spite of the Vernacular Press Act the heroic band of early workers continued their work undaunted. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* was dramatically converted in one night into an English newspaper. Other papers in the English language sprang into existence. A vigorous agitation was started. Meetings were held in the principal towns of India. Babu Surendranath Banerjea who had entered politics after dismissal from the Indian Civil Service toured the country calling on the people to realise their duties and responsibilities.

LORD RIPON.

The increasing disturbance in the mind of the educated classes did not seem to have passed unnoticed when a wise, able and sympathetic statesman in the person of Lord Ripon was appointed as the Viceroy of India. Soon after his assumption of the reins of administration Lord Ripon took up salutary measures of reform. He repealed the Vernacular Press Act. He inaugurated the beginnings of local self-government which he considered as the foundation of National Self-Government. Lord Ripon did not bring any original conception of Local Self-Government. But he had imagination to realise that the organisation of village panchayats which had stood the test of ages and survived the shock of invasions living their even tenour of life in the serene rural atmosphere

on modern lines would greatly conduce to the benefit of the country. It is needless to go into his entire scheme. Suffice it to say that its spirit was stifled by a successive administration and agents of the bureaucracy, with the result that the panchayats of old dwindled, decayed, and disappeared; Municipal bodies in larger areas were no doubt unified and organised with a view to facilitate the work of the District Magistrate and Collector. English writers have admitted that "two hundred and odd district councils and the seven hundred Municipalities of British India have, compared with the ancient institutions of the village, a somewhat artificial air."

Thus the good intentions of Lord Ripon were defeated by the Indian Civil Service which had formed itself into a close corporation, a governing caste.

THE WHITE MUTINY

The opposition of the Indian Civil Service and non-official Europeans to Lord Ripon's reforming zeal reached its climax when he introduced the famous Ilbert Bill (1883) with the object of removing the ban on the Indian Magistracy in regard to the trial on European offenders. The Viceroy was reviled in the Anglo-Indian Press with a frenzy unknown to Indian journalism before. The character and competence of the people of India too were attacked by the leaders of an "Anglo-Indian Defence Association" which was formed to conduct an offensive campaign against Lord Ripon and the Ilbert Bill. Not satisfied with constitutional agitation and unparliamentary language, the Anglo Indian extremists went a step further. They wanted to try conclusions with a Viceroy who had

the temerity to introduce reforms which went against the grain of the Anglo Indian community, small as it was. Mr. Buckland has placed it on record that "a conspiracy had been formed by a number of men in Calcutta who had bound themselves in the event of Government adhering to their projected legislation to overpower the sentries at the Government House, to put the Viceroy on board a steamer at Chand Lal Ghat and send him to England *via* the Cape." Lord Ripon had to abandon at last, in view of the artificial agitation of a handful of sojourners, a matter of fundamental principle and barest justice.

THE CONGRESS

The Ilbert Bill controversy served as an eye-opener to the English educated patriots who realized the value of organization in public life to bring pressure to bear on the powers-that-be. It was also felt that if the Indian public were alert and disciplined, the hands of a sympathetic Viceroy could be considerably strengthened and Anglo-Indian hostility effectively neutralized. The Indian Association of Calcutta organized a National Conference with a view to start constitutional agitation for the rights and privileges of Indians. A new Association called the National League was established in Bengal in 1884 to further safeguard the rights of the people. The Madras Mahajana Sabha was ushered into existence to awaken in the people of that presidency a sense of national consciousness. The Presidency Association of Bombay and the Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona were doing useful service in their respective spheres. The activities of the Provincial organizations had to be guid-

ed by a national organization the need for which had dawned on the minds of the leaders of the time. Allan Octavian Hume mentioned the idea to the then Viceroy Lord Dufferin who welcomed it. In the words of Mr. W. C. Banerjea whom Mr. Hume had taken into his confidence, Lord Dufferin said that "there was no body of persons in this country who performed the functions which her Majesty's opposition did in England. The Newspapers even if they really represented the views of the people were not reliable and as the English were necessarily ignorant of what was thought of them and their policy in the native circles it would be every desirable in the interests as well of the rulers as of the ruled that Indian politicians should meet early and point out to the Government in what respects the administration was defective and how it could be improved."

THE FIRST CONGRESS

When the first Congress met in Bombay in 1885 it pointed out to the Government its defects and shortcomings and the ways and means of effecting an improvement. It demanded (a) The abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, (b) The reform and expansion of the Supreme and existing Local Legislative Councils. (c) The holding of simultaneous competitive examinations in England and in India for appointments in various Civil departments of the Public Service instead of in England only as hitherto. (d) The reduction of the military expenditure.

COUNCIL REFORM.

The second session of the Congress which was held at Calcutta in 1886 gave a definite shape to the reform propo-

sals by formulating a tentative scheme according to which not less than one half of the members of the enlarged councils were to be elected and not more than one-fourth to be officials having seats *ex-officio*. All legislative measures and financial questions including Budgets whether these involved net or enhanced taxation or not were to be submitted to and dealt with by these Councils. The Congress scheme at the same time, conceded to the Executive Government the power of overruling the decision of the majority of the Council in case the acceptance of that decision would be prejudicial to public interest. But it stipulated that the exercise of that power would be followed by the publication of the Government's explanation, which failing to carry conviction, the overruled majority could appeal to the Standing Committee which, if it felt necessary, could report to the full House. ✓

LEGAL AND MILITARY REFORMS.

The Congress also asked for the extension of the system of trial by Jury into many parts of the country where it was not in existence, the withdrawal of the power vested in Sessions Judges and High Courts of setting aside verdicts of acquittal, thus depriving the verdicts of juries of all finality; the introduction into the Indian Code of Criminal Procedure a provision, similar to that embodied in the summary jurisdiction Act of England, enabling accused persons in warrant cases, to demand, if they so desired, trial by the Court of Sessions instead of by the Magistrate; and last but not least, the complete separation of judicial and executive functions.

The Calcutta Congress also appealed to the Government to authorise a system of volunteering.

The third Session of the Congress which was held at Madras, besides confirming the Resolutions of its predecessors resolved (1) That the military service in its higher grades should be opened to Indians and that military colleges should be established in India to educate and train Indians for a military career as officers of the Indian army (b) That the arms Act be modified. (c) That a system of technical education be introduced to encourage indigenous manufactures and utilise indigenous talents and skill.

CONGRESS AND THE GOVERNMENT.

The demands of the Congress were not viewed with approval by Anglo-India. Even Lord Dufferin who himself had suggested the idea of the Congress playing the part of Her Majesty's opposition appeared to be influenced by his bureaucratic environment. Speaking at St. Andrew's Dinner at Calcutta on November 30, 1888, Lord Dufferin ridiculed the Congressmen as "a microscopic minority", a phrase which the Anglo-Indian Press was destined to repeat for over 30 years and characterised their aim as "a big jump into the unknown." When the fourth Congress met at Allahabad on the 26th December, Mr. George Yule who presided did not mind the vapourings of responsible men, for, he pointed out every great movement had to pass through three stages of ridicule, abuse and concession. And one of the vigilant friends of the Congress in England, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, took the Indian Viceroy to severe task in one of his important pronouncements. Lord Dufferin unlike his proud successors prone to cover their mistake under the camouflage of prestige, frankly explained in a letter which he wrote

to Mr. Bradlaugh that "he had not misrepresented the Congress, that he neither directly nor by implication suggested that the Congress was seditious, that he always spoke of the Congress in terms of sympathy and respect and treated its members with great personal civility, that he was always in favour of a Civil Service reform so that Indians might obtain more appointments in it as proved by his appointments of the Indian Civil Service Commission and that he himself was in favour of such a reform of the Provincial Councils as he (Mr. Bradlaugh) appeared to advocate."

COUNCIL REFORM; FIRST OFFICIAL ATTEMPT.

Lord Dufferin initiated discussion on the question of Council reforms and his Committee recommended that Councils should see all papers freely and discuss all matters openly and that the Budget estimates should be considered by a Standing Committee and if necessary, by the Councils themselves. The Dufferin Committee further suggested that members should be elected but not more than two-fifths and power should be reserved to Government to pass certain measures even if the majority went against them.

Lord Dufferin himself was not prepared to go so far as his Committee. "No matter to what degree the liberalisation of the Councils may take place," said he "it will be necessary to leave in the hands of each Provincial Government the ultimate decision upon all important questions and the paramount control of its own policy. It is in this view that we have arranged that the nominated members of the Council should outnumber the elected members at the same time that the Governor has been em-

powered to overrule his Council whenever he feels himself called upon by circumstances to do so."

If the Viceroy whittled away some of the forward aspects of the proposals of his Committee, the Secretary of State turned over the Viceregal recommendations altogether and gave a paltry substitute in their place. Lord Cross considered it "unwise to introduce" the principle of election which, he said, was "a fundamental change." Mr. Gladstone himself, speaking for the opposition in the House of Commons was not "at all disposed to ask them at once to produce" what he felt to be "large and imposing results" and would content himself by "looking presumptively with the greatest amount of expectation and hope to the Municipal bodies and the Local authorities in India in which the elective elements is already included."

The ninth Congress which met at Lahore in 1893 resolved that in regard to the Council's Act of 1892 there should be material alterations alike in the Rules of the Government of India and in the practice of most of the Local Governments and further deplored that the Punjab should still be denied the right to be represented either in the Viceroy's or in any Local Council. Four years later the Punjab was given "the boon" as the Congress in its exuberance of gratitude called it, of a Legislative Council but the Councillors had neither the right of interpellation nor the people the right of recommending Councillors for nomination, which the other provinces enjoyed.

"LAW AND ORDER"

With the growth of public life in the country the Govern-

ment began to strengthen the Police with a view to check that growth. When the 13th Congress met at Amroati in 1897 it had to pronounce its verdict on a strange situation that the bureaucracy had developed in the course of the year in certain parts of the country. The plague measures at Poona had shocked the orthodoxy of the Indian community; soldiers had trespassed into ladies' quarters in Hindu and Moslem houses; family temples have been polluted; the president of the Plague Committee was murdered; the Natu brothers who had passionately appealed to the Government to interfere were for imprisoned without trial; Mr. Tilak and the editors of the two Vernacular papers were prosecuted and sentenced; the British and the Anglo-Indian Press demanded that the Vernacular Press should be gagged. Lord George Hamilton the Secretary of State for India levelled a sweeping indictment against a whole nation when he said in the House of Commons. "In India almost without warning, an apparently peaceful population might suddenly become as dangerous as criminal lunatics, with but one object before them—to murder the class alien to them." Changes were also proposed in the law of sedition to deal a severe blow to the liberty of speech and writing and to increase the powers of the Police. The exercise of the special powers given by the Bengal Regulation III of 1818, Madras Regulation II of 1819 and Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827 reminded the country of the *lettres de cachet* of Bourbon times. The quartering of the Punitive Police at Poona was disapproved. Babu Surendranath Banerjea, said speaking from the Congress platform: "Brother delegates, security of life and property are the great foun-

dations upon which rests the vast, the stupendous, the colossal fabric of British rule in India. What becomes of these inestimable blessings if at any moment your property may be confiscated, and you may be arrested and left in custody without a trial and without a word of explanation? What becomes of the boasted vaunt of the boon of personal liberty and personal security under British rule under these circumstances." The faith of the stalwarts of the Congress in British justice was so great indeed that Mr. W. C. Bonnerjea considered that the remedy to the situation lay in appealing to the British public: "I have no doubt" said he "that the British nation will rise in their wrath, and free us from the trammels which Lord Elgin and his Councillors are forging for us." In vain did the Congress agitate against the coercive policy. Two of its resolutions may be reproduced as they show how it fully realised the dangerous potentialities of the increase of the power of the Police and widening of the scope of the seditious laws.

Resolved—that this Congress views with alarm and anxiety the changes proposed in the existing law of sedition as defined in section 124 A, and of circulating false reports as defined in section 505 of the Indian Penal Code and is of opinion that section 124, A of the Indian Penal Code requires amendment not in the direction of greater stringency but in that of greater freedom and if the law of sedition in India is to be made the same as it is in England, the administration of it must be safeguarded in substantially the same way as it is there, viz., that the trial of accused persons must always be by jury at least one half of whom should be persons of the same nationality as the accused, and that their verdict should be unanimous. And this Congress strongly protests against cases of sedition being made triable by Magistrates and not by Courts of Sessions and High Courts exclusively, as hitherto, and against the proposal to invest District Magistrates with the power of calling upon persons who in their opinion disseminate disaffection, to find sureties of good behaviour for

twelve months. This Congress is further of opinion that the changes in the law now proposed will be altogether at variance with the pledges given by Sir James Fitz-James Stephen when passing section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code through the Council and will deal an irreparable blow to liberty of speech and freedom of the Press thus retarding the progress of the country and creating terror instead of confidence in the minds of the people.

Resolved—that this Congress desires to record its protest against the Criminal Procedure Bill of 1897 now pending before the Imperial Legislative Council as being a retrograde and reactionary measure which will add to the already large powers of the Police, invest Magistrates with a discretionary authority which they do not now possess, and curtail the powers of the High Courts, all to the extreme prejudice of accused persons,

PROPOGANDA IN ENGLAND

These modest and moderate demands of men who clung to the English King and Parliament with affection and devotion were brushed aside often, and whenever they were considered, it was too late and whatever concession that came was too halting and hesitating, more shadowy than real. The confirmation year after year of the Congress resolution on matters administrative, military, financial and legal did not produce the desired effect. Between 1880 and 1900 there were four famines which in the opinion of the Congress were due to the appalling poverty intensified by the enormous drain of the national wealth, excessive taxation and over-assessment brought on by a policy of waste, followed by the government both in the civil and military departments. The elders of the Congress waited in deputation on the Viceroy and sent their representatives to England. The first deputation went in 1889; a year after another influential deputation followed. Mr. W. C. Bannerjee and Dadabhai Naoroji practically made England their second home and the latter entered Parliament in course of time. An influential

British Congress Committee was appointed and the Congress voted Rs. 45,000 for its expenses. In 1890, the newspaper *India* was started under the competent editorship of Mr. William Digby who rendered valuable service to India by his remarkable exposure of foreign drain and internal administration both financial and economic. An Indian Parliamentary Committee was organised with a view to throw light on the ignorance of members of Parliament to rouse an interest in them for the welfare of India's millions and also to combat the activities of the India Council which Congressmen felt had become an asylum of fossilized bureaucrats.

THE WELBY COMMISSION

The strenuous work done in England resulted in the appointment of a Royal commission of enquiry known as the "Welby Commission" but its scope was narrowed and usefulness limited as pointed out by the Madras Congress of 1894 by leaving out "an inquiry into the ability of the Indian people to bear their existing financial burdens and into the financial relation between India and the United Kingdom". A Congress deputation consisting of Wacha, Gokhale and Surendranath Banerjea proceeded to England to give evidence before this Commission. While feeling thankful to the Commission for having afforded an opportunity to representative Indians to state the case on behalf of India, the Congress urged (1) that the new official members of the Viceroy's Council may be made more directly representative of the Indian people and that they may have a right to move amendments and divide the Council upon the provisions of the budget. (2) That military and other unproductive expenditure be

reduced and that larger amounts be spent in promoting the welfare and progress of the people. (3) And that the public services be Indianised with a view to effecting large saving and more efficient administration. This demand of the Congress too was ignored for long years. A considerable section of the Indian people began to feel that Committees and Commissions were but a blind, a mere comouflage.

THE NATIONALIST PARTY

The repetition of prayers, deputations and resolutions of the Congress were considered undignified by a party of nationalists who felt that agitation hitherto confined only to the surface must go deep down into the bosom of the masses. When Lord Curzon's appointment as Viceroy was announced, the Congress accorded him "a respectful welcome" and hoped that the "policy of progress and confidence in the people" would be followed by him. Lord Curzon's regime shattered the hopes of the Congress with the passing of the Official Secret's Act and the Indian Universities Act. The partition of Bengal completed the tragedy. The Official excesses during the partition are within the memory of the public and I need not go into the details. When the Congress met at Bombay in 1904, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta who was the Chairman of the Reception Committee exhorted his countrymen to have "faith in the ultimate wisdom, beneficence and righteousness of the English people." But Bengal did not think that there was such a thing as generosity in English politics. Both Moderates and Nationalists in Bengal preached with one voice and mind the philosophy of self-help and the boycott of foreign

goods. When the Congress met at Benares under the Presidency of Gokhale, Bengal and the whole of India were passing through a very anxious period. The Official report of the Congress describes the crisis as the darkest since Lord Lytton's viceroyalty. "India", says the report "was the target for so much scorn and calumny emanating from the highest quarters,—its most moderate demands ridiculed and scouted, its most reasonable prayers greeted with stiff negative, its noblest aspirations spurned and denounced as pure mischief, a salmon nonsense, its most cherished ideals hurled down from the pedestal and trodden under foot." The leaders who had assembled from all parts of the country anxiously considered the critical juncture in the life of the nation. The ideal of Colonial Self-Government with which the moderates were contented, was repudiated by what the Anglo-Indian press characterised as "the Extremist" party, which also repudiated the beneficent intentions of the British. The Congress met next year at Surat only to part company with the advanced wing. The bureaucracy taking full advantage of a split in the camp attempted to scorch the Nationalist movement by terrorism. Some young men of Bengal answered terrorism by terrorism. The estrangement between the bureaucracy and people would have been complete had the Congress embarked on non-co-operation. But it preferred to give it yet another chance.

MORLY-MINTO REFORMS.

Lord Morely lost no time in rallying the Congressmen by introducing what is known as the Morely-Minto reforms with the novel feature of separate representation

which the Congress deprecated on principle and which reminded several Congressmen that the Government were pursuing the old traditions of *divide et impera*. The reforms were not wholly satisfying even to the moderates through they welcomed what was conceded and decided to give them a fair trial. The Nationalists looked upon the reforms as something shadowy. The substantial thing was repression which the Morley-Minto regime carried through with unrelenting zeal. The Seditious Meetings Act was passed into law only to be followed by the passing of the Press Act. Thus independent and outspoken public opinion outside the Councils was fiercely repressed. Regulations of 1818 were freely used both by Lord Minto and his successor Lord Hardinge and thousands of brilliant young men of Bengal were interned without trial. In vain did the Congress protest against this abnoxious policy.

THE WAR

The dissatisfaction in the country was in the ascendant when war broke out. True to its traditions, the Congress buried the dead past and leading Congressmen co-operated with the Government in maintaining peace and securing recruits. A war measure known as the Defence of India Act was passed with the approval of the Indian Legislative Council and though Lord Hardinge expressly stated that it was a war measure "meant to deal summarily with the King's enemy, political agitators like the Ali Bros., and Mrs. Annie Besant were interned under that Act. The country protested against these excesses but still co-operated with the government. Mahatma Gandhi was busy finding recruits for the

government. Hand in hand with the co-operation with the government, an organised agitation was carried on in the country for Home rule. Finding that the people had awakened as never before, to a sense of their rights, the Government wisely decided to satisfy the wishes of the people so far as they might without at the same time relinquishing their real power.

THE REFORMS AND THE ROWLATT ACT.

The Secretary of State for India made an announcement on August 20th, 1917, promising "the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India, as an integral part of the British Empire." The announcement made it clear that "progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and the advancement of the Indian peoples, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility." This announcement did not satisfy the advanced Nationalists, but the Congress welcomed it and the Congressmen fully co-operated with the Montagu Commission. The Montagu Chelmsford report was to be embodied in an Act of Parliament. But its good effect was destroyed by the notorious Rowlatt Act which brought to the front a deeply religious man of spotless character, a

saint whom the masses worship as a Mahatma. Under his leadership the people rose in defence of their right of freedom, which they felt was in grave danger and resisted the Rowlatt Act with *Satyagraha*. The whole country observed a peaceful hartal on April 6th which was so spontaneous and so successful that it caused confusion in the government. Not accustomed to general strikes unaccompanied by riots and bloodshed, the Anglo-Indians as reflected by their writings in the press, imagined honestly or pretended that the hartal was the harbinger of the red ruin. Sir Michael O'Dwyer who was Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab availed himself of the opportunity to break the anti-British combination as he felt, the hartal to be, deported two prominent leaders of Amritsar and arrested Mahatma Gandhi himself who was on his way to the Punjab. The arrest of the Mahatma was the match which fired the train. Mobs demonstrated their frenzy. Disturbances which followed in Amritsar gave General Dyer an opportunity to produce "sufficient moral effect from a military point of view", and the Government enforced Martial Law in certain selected areas.

MARTIAL LAW

I need not go into the Martial Law regime and the systematic efforts of Sir Michael O'Dwyer to crush everything manly and patriotic in the Punjabi race. The Martial Law terrorism shocked the people in a manner which could not be described in words. The evidence before the Hunter Committee and the confession of General Dyer established the guilt of the responsible officers of the Punjab and the atrocious injustice they had perpetrated

on a wholesale scale. The gulf of estrangement between the Europeans and Indians had considerably widened and His Majesty the King attempted to bridge it by issuing a Amnesty. The Indian National Congress which met a few weeks later tried to take a most reasonable and moderate view under exasperating circumstances. The President of the Congress, Pandit Motilal Nehru, advised the assembled delegates not to boycott the reforms but to work them for what they were worth. He said "The Act is not based on the wishes of the people of India and its provisions fall short of the minimum demands made by the Congress. But let us not belittle the good that the Act does us." But the bureaucracy weakened the hands of the Moderates like Pandit Nehru by persisting in their foolish policy of alienating all sections of Indians.

THE KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

As if the exasperation caused by the Punjab tragedy was not enough, Moslem sentiment was outraged by the treatment meted out to Turkey and the Khilafat. Mr. Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, had made a solemn declaration on the 6th January 1918 which included the following pledge. "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race." When the war was over, it was fast becoming clear that the British Prime Minister was not going to fulfil his pledged word. The draft terms of Peace with Turkey had not been published but the state of things in the Near East was far from encouraging. Every Mussalman of India was asking, in the words of the President of the Amritsar Congress: "With Arabia

independent, with foreign powers governing Mesopotamia, Syria and Armenia in the guise of Mandatories, with Palestine restored to the Jews, with the Greeks securely lodged in Symrna and the Hinterland, what may I ask is the position of the Khilafat." The Muslim press and public made it quite clear that the Khilafat was the very essence of Islam and its temporal and spiritual strength and importance should remain intact. Muslim pain and distress were fully brought out by their non-participation in the Peace celebrations from which the patriotic Hindus also abstained in deference to their brothers in adversity. The Anti-Turkish organs in the Christian countries plainly demanded the expulsion of Turkey bag and baggage from Constantinople. Even Moderate Mussalmans were considerably perturbed by this attitude of the Turcophobes. A deputation waited on the Viceroy who in turn assured that his Government was doing their utmost to impress on His Majesty's Government that Indian Muslim opinion and sentiment should receive their most sympathetic attention before any final settlement could be arrived at with the Allies in regard to Turkey and her Dominions. The advanced Muslims treated this as mere lip-sympathy and called on the community not to be misled by words which were not substantiated by deeds. The postponement of the publication of the Draft Peace Terms only created further suspicion in the minds of the Muslim community which was by this time united, unanimous in its desire that Turkey should not be dismembered and the Khilafat should retain the same old prestige and power. The Viceroy of India did not seem to have appreciated the gravity of the issue or the depth

of Indian and Muslim feeling. Speaking to the members of the Indian Legislative Council at the end of January, 1920, His Excellency appears to have imagined that the present agitation was but a passing phase. "There may be clouds in our sky" said Lord Chelmsford, "but the shadows they cast are relieved by much that is bright." His plea was that the group of politicians who were enthusiastic about the reforms, should "set up a bulwark of sanity and moderation against the forces of disorder and destruction." And the gentlemen to whom those words were addressed seemed to be equally out of touch with the people of India. "Let us live together in peace and amity," said Sir Surendranath Banerjea, "in the cultivation of those friendly relations which alone can make for our mutual advantage and mutual prosperity. We, the educated Indians, are prepared to extend the hand of fellowship and friendship to the servants of the Government, to the representatives of the European community."

Whatever immediate effect these exchanges of compliments might have produced in the Council chamber, they produced no impression on the country. Popular feeling was getting more and more exerted over the Khilafat question. A Khilafat deputation headed by Maulana Mahomed Ali proceeded to England. The messages that it sent from time to time only intensified the extreme solicitude of the people in general and the Mussalmans in particular. The interview between the Prime Minister and the Khilafat deputation added fuel to the fire. Mr. Lloyd George was frankly disappointing and Mr. Mahomed Ali informed the country that he was more and more convinced that the battle of the Khilafat had to be fought

on Indian soul. Maulana Shaukat Ali had already issued a manifesto that the Mussalmans could be no longer loyal to England when that loyalty clashed with their faithful adherence to the *Khilafat-al-Islam*. Mahatma Gandhi proclaimed that the 19th of March, 1920 would be observed as a Day of National Mourning in the Khilafat cause. In a manifesto which he published on March 10 the Mahatma plainly stated his intentions if the Khilafat demands were not granted: "The barbarous method is warfare open or secret. This must be ruled out only because it is impracticable." The civilized method was non-violent non-co-operation on which he courageously and deliberately launched the country. This made the panicky Bureaucracy nervous. They decided to combat the observance of the Khilafat Day by passing a resolution prohibiting Government servants from participating in it. The Government being alien in character and out of touch with the people naturally lacked the imagination to perceive that loyalty was of the heart which could neither be manufactured at the point of bayonet or by a threatening proclamation.

When the country was seething with indignation, the report of the Congress Commission on the Punjab disturbances saw the light of day. It must be within the memory of my readers what a shock the country received on reading the gruesome revelations. The publication of some of the terrific havocs on life and honor caused widespread alarm and excitement. The Congress Commissioners recommended certain measures necessary for redressing the wrong done to the people, for the purification of the administration and for preventing a repetition in future

of official lawlessness such as the repeal of the Rowlatt Act, the relieving of Sir Michael O'Dwyer of any responsible office under the Crown, the relieving of other guilty officers and officials of any position of responsibility under the Crown. The dismissal of minor officials charged with corrupt practice on proof of their guilt, the recall of the Viceroy, refund of fines and remission of all indemnity. The Congress Commissioners deliberately refrained from advising any drastic course such as impeachment of the guilty officers as it felt that "future purity will be sufficiently guaranteed by the dismissal of the officials concerned." For over a month the Punjab report was discussed in the press and on the platform when the Turkish Peace Terms were announced.

THE TURKISH PEACE TERMS

The publication of the draft terms of the Turkish Peace in May was treated by the entire Muslim community as a deliberate breach of the pledged word given by Mr. Lloyd George. The Government of India knew that the Peace terms must be cruelly disappointing to the Muslims and the Viceroy sympathised with them saying that the Peace included "terms which must be painful to all Moslems." His Excellency also complimented the Muslims of "the splendid response" made by them "in the days of the Empire's need." This only aggravated—if anything—the Muslim feeling. The Viceroy expressed the hope that with Treaty would take new life again in the old friendship of England and Turkey, which thought, His Excellency trusted, would strengthen the Mussalmans" to accept the Peace terms with resignation, courage and fortitude" and to keep their "loyalty

towards the Crown bright and untarnished "as it has been for so many generations." Matters became distinctly worse for the Government when the report of the Hunter Committee was published. It was divided on racial lines in their dissenting minutes, the Indian members established that there was no justification for the introduction of Martial Law as the disturbances could have been suppressed without abrogation of civil authority. The Government tried to allay the situation by soft words

Neither the views and findings of the Government of India on the Hunter Report nor the pronouncement of His Majesty's Government which it must be admitted was strong in its disapproval of General Dyer's action, could satisfy the Indian people. The least that the Government could have done to soften ascerbities would have been to enforce the minimum demands of the Amritsar Congress and the Congress Commissioners. But the demand of the Amritsar Congress and the recommendations of the Congress Commisioners to heal the Punjab sores were not respected or listened to by the Government. The Anglo-Indian Press spoke with utter contempt for Indian feeling and paid flattering tributes to General Dyer as "the saviour of the British Empire in India." Lord Chelmsford continued in his high office. Sir Michael O'Dwyer was not relieved of his responsibilities. Other guilty officials were left unpunished. As General Dyer could not be absolutely saved, he was retired on half pay. The English and Anglo-Indian admirers of the General opened a fund in honour of his "achievements" in the Jallianwala Bagh and liberally contributed towards it. When the Punjab

question came up for discussion in the House of Lords, it virtually supported Dyerian frightfulness. The attitude of the Anglo-Indian and British community and that of the House of Lords was considered by the Indian public as an insult of the first magnitude and an index of the mentality of the rulers of the land.

NON-CO-OPERATION

A Conference was convened at Allahabad (June 3, 1920) of the representative Indian leaders of all parties and creeds to consider the crucial situation. Under the auspices of the Khilafat Committee, a new Committee was appointed with Mahatma Gandhi as its guiding spirit to ascertain and enforce the wish of the Nation in regard to Non-co-operation to crystallize which a special session of the Congress was held at Calcutta in September, 1920. The reforms since embodied in an Act of Parliament had no attraction for the delegates all of whom recognised that it had no power either to right the Khilafat wrong or prevent a repetition of the Punjab atrocities. Leaders like Mr. Pal and Mr. Das who advocated from the Congress platform the capture of the Councils did so not with a view to co-operate with the bureaucracy but to obstruct its work and to paralyze the legislature. Indeed India was faced with the tragic failure of the old policy of opposition-cum-co-operation and the necessity to adopt a bold and independent method to put an end to a system of irresponsible autocratic Government. The Congress delegates recognized that they had only two alternatives before them—armed revolt or non-violent non-co-operation. Armed revolt was out of the question. To some it was beyond

the range of practical politics. Others were opposed to it on principle. Muslim feeling was considerably exercised. Over 18000 Mussalmans had already gone on Hijrat to Afghanistan. The Special Congress decided to embark on a course of non-co-operation. And Mahatma Gandhi preached the new gospel like an inspired prophet in *Young India*.

C. S. RANGA IYER.

YOUNG INDIA

INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

8th October, 1919

Mr. M. K. Gandhi wrote the following article in the first issue of the Weekly 'Young India' at the time of the transfer of the paper to Ahmedabad from Bombay —

“YOUNG INDIA” from this week enters upon a new stage. It became a bi-weekly when Mr. Horniman was deported and the “Chronicle” was strangled. Ever since the “Chronicle’s” re-birth, the syndicate and I have been considering the advisability of reverting to the weekly issue. The conversion of “Nava Jivan” into a weekly and its coming under my charge has hastened the decision. The burden of conducting a bi-weekly and a weekly is too great a strain on me and a weekly “Young India” will now serve almost as well as a bi-weekly. An endeavour will be made to give as much matter as was given in the bi-weekly. The annual subscription will now be Rs. 4 instead of Rs. 8 and the (price of a single copy will be one anna) instead of two (without postage.) Subscribers may either have the balance due to this change returned to them or the

amount may be credited to the next year's account. Those subscribers who may be dissatisfied with the change can have the proportionate payment refunded to them on application.

The headquarters of "Young India" have been transferred to Ahmedabad for better management, and in order to enable me to devote some time to the Satyagrah Ashram which, owing to my continued absence from it, was being somewhat neglected by me. Moreover, it was obviously uneconomical in every respect to edit two papers at two different places. This deprives me of the privilege of being with Bombay friends as much as I have lately been. But I hope they will forgive me, if the new arrangement results, as I hope it will, in greater service to the country.

"Young India" has hitherto been chiefly occupied in dealing with the Punjab affairs. But one may reasonably hope that the cloud will lift in the near future.

What will "Young India" then present to its readers? I frankly confess that to me, editing a newspaper in English, is no pleasure. I feel that, in occupying myself with that work, I am not making the best use of my time. And, but for the Madras Presidency, I should now leave the work of editing "Young India". It is true that I should at times like to make my views in matters of general interest known to the Government. But I do not need to control a newspaper merely for that purpose.

The editing of "Nava Jivan" has been a perfect revelation to me. Whilst "Young India" has a little more than 1,200 subscribers, "Nava Jivan" has 12,000. The number would leap to 20,000 if we would but get

printers to print that number. It shows that a vernacular newspaper is a felt want. I am proud to think that I have numerous readers among farmers and workers. They make India. Their poverty is India's curse and crime. Their prosperity alone can make India a country fit to live in. They represent nearly 80 p. c. of India's population. The English journals touch but the fringe of the ocean of India's population.

Whilst therefore I hold it to be the duty of every English-knowing Indian to translate the best of the English thought in the vernaculars for the benefit of the masses, I recognise that for a few years to come, *i.e.*, until we have accepted Hindustani as the common medium among the cultured classes and until Hindustani becomes compulsory in our schools as a second language, educated India, especially in the Madras Presidency, must be addressed in English.

But I will not be party to editing a newspaper that does not pay its way. "Young India" cannot pay its way unless it has at least 2,500 paying subscribers. I must appeal to my Tamil friends to see to it that the requisite number of subscribers is found, if they wish to see "Young India" continued.

The more so now, because the proprietors of "Young India" have decided to give up all advertisements. I know that they have not been entirely, if at all, converted to my view that a newspaper ought to be conducted without advertisements. But they are willing to let me make the experiment. I invite those who wish to see "Young India" free from the curse of advertisements to help me to make the venture a success. The Gujarati

“Nava Jivan” has already demonstrated the possibility of conducting a newspaper without advertisements soiling its pages. What a financial gain it would be to the country, if there was for each province only one advertising medium—not a newspaper—containing innocent, unvarnished notices of things useful for the public! But for our criminal indifference, we would decline to pay the huge indirect taxation by way of mischievous advertisements. Some readers who are interested in the purity of journalism recently sent me a most indecent advertisement extracted from a well-known newspaper, I have refused to soil the pages of “Nava Jivan” by reproducing it. But anyone turning to the advertisement sheets of even leading journals can verify the aptness of my criticism.

A word as to the policy of “Young India”. Apart from its duty of drawing attention to injustices to individuals, it will devote its attention to constructive Satyagraha as also sometimes cleaning Satyagraha. Cleansing Satyagraha is civil resistance where resistance becomes a duty to remove a persistent and degrading injustice such as the Rowlatt Act.

THE SATYAGRAHA MOVEMENT

BEGINNINGS OF THE MOVEMENT

THE statement, submitted by Mr. Gandhi to the Hunter Committee, surveying the beginning of the Satyagraha Movement in India.*

General Principles.—For the past thirty years, I have been preaching and practising Satyagraha. The principles of Satyagraha, as I know it to-day, constitute a gradual evolution.

Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end, whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form. ✓

The term Satyagraha was coined by me in South Africa to express the force that the Indians there used for full eight years and it was coined in order to distinguish it from the movement then going on in the United Kingdom and South Africa under the name of Passive Resistance.

Its root meaning is holding on to Truth, hence Truth-force. I have also called it Love-force or Soul-force.

* *Young India* Nov. 1919.

In the application of Satyagraha, I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of Truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For what appears to be Truth to the one may appear to be error to the other. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of Truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self.

But, on the political field, the struggle on behalf of the people mostly consists in opposing error in the shape of unjust laws. When you have failed to bring the error home to the law-giver by way of petitions and the like, the only remedy open to you, if you do not wish to submit to error, is to compel him by physical force to yield to you or by suffering in your own person by inviting the penalty for the breach of the law. Hence Satyagraha largely appears to the public as Civil Disobedience or Civil Resistance. It is civil in the sense that it is not criminal.

The law-breaker breaks the law surreptitiously and tries to avoid the penalty; not so the civil resister. He ever obeys the laws of the State to which he belongs, not out of fear of the sanctions, but because he considers them to be good for the welfare of society. But there come occasions, generally rare, when he considers certain laws to be so unjust as to render obedience to them a dishonour. He then openly and civilly breaks them and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach. And in order to register his protest against the action of the law givers, it is open to him to with-

draw his co-operation from the State by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not involve moral turpitude.

In my opinion, the beauty and efficacy of Satyagraha are so great and the doctrine so simple that it can be preached even to children. It was preached by me to thousands of men, women and children commonly called indentured Indians with excellent results.

Rowlatt Bills.—When the Rowlatt Bills were published, I felt that they were so restrictive of human liberty that they must be resisted to the utmost. I observed too that the opposition to them was universal among Indians. I submit that no State, however despotic, has the right to enact laws which are repugnant to the whole body of the people, much less a government guided by constitutional usage and precedent such as the Indian Government. I felt too that the oncoming agitation needed a definite direction if it was neither to collapse nor to run into violent channels.

The 6th April.—I ventured therefore to present Satyagraha to the country, emphasising its Civil Resistance aspect. And, as it is purely an inward and purifying movement, I suggested the observance of fast, prayer and suspension of all work for one day—the 6th of April. There was a magnificent response throughout the length and breadth of India, even in little villages, although there was no organization and no great previous preparation. The idea was given to the public as soon as it was conceived. On the 6th April there was no violence used by the people and no collision with the police worth naming. The *hartal* was purely voluntary

and spontaneous. I attach hereto the letter* in which the idea was announced.

My arrest.—The observance of the 6th April was to be followed by Civil Disobedience. For that the Committee of the Satyagraha Sabha had selected certain political laws for disobedience. And we commenced the distribution of prohibited literature of a perfectly healthy type, e.g., a pamphlet written by me on Home Rule, a translation of Ruskin's 'Unto this Last', 'The Defence and Death of Socrates' etc.

Disorder.—But there is no doubt that the 6th of April found India vitalised as never before. The people who were fear-stricken ceased to fear authority. Moreover, hitherto the masses had lain inert. The leaders had not really acted upon them. They were undisciplined. They had found a new force but they did not know what it was and how to use it.

At Delhi, the leaders found it difficult to restrain the very large number of people who had remained unmoved before. At Amritsar, Dr. Satyapal was anxious that I should go there and show to the people the peaceful nature of Satyagraha. Swami Sharaddhanandji from Delhi and Dr. Satyapal from Amritsar wrote to me asking me to go to their respective places for pacifying the people and for explaining to them the nature of Satyagraha. I had never been to Amritsar and, for that matter, to the Punjab before. These two messages were seen by the authorities and they knew that I was invited to both the places for peaceful purposes.

* The letter emphasised the purifying aspect of the movement and urged that absolutely no compulsion or pressure should be used.

I left Bombay for Delhi and the Punjab on the 8th April and had telegraphed to Dr. Satyapal whom I had never met before to meet me at Delhi. But, after passing Muttra, I was served with an order prohibiting me from entering the province of Delhi. I felt that I was bound to disregard this order and I proceeded on my journey. At Palwal, I was served with an order prohibiting me from entering the Punjab and confining me to the Bombay Presidency. And I was arrested by a party of Police and taken off the train at that station. The Superintendent of the Police who arrested me acted with every courtesy. I was taken to Muttra by the first available train and thence by goods train early in the morning to Siwai Madhupur, where I joined the Bombay Mail from Peshawar and was taken charge of by Superintendent Bowring. I was discharged at Bombay on the 10th April.

But the people of Ahmedabad and Viramgam and in Gujarat generally had heard of my arrest. They became furious, shops were closed, crowds gathered, and murder, arson, pillage, wire-cutting and attempt at derailment followed.

Causes.—I had worked in the midst of Kaira raiyats just before and had mixed among thousands of men and women. I had worked at the instance of and with Miss Ansuya Sarabhai among the mill-hands of Ahmedabad. The mill-hands appreciated her philanthropic work and adored her. The fury of the labourers in Ahmedabad reached white heat when a false rumour was started that she too was arrested. Both of us had visited and interceded for the mill-hands of Viramgam when they were in trouble. And it is my firm belief that the excesses were

due to the great resentment of the mobs over my arrest and the rumoured arrest of Miss Ansuya Sarabhai.

I have mixed with the masses in practically the whole of India and talked to them freely. I do not believe that there was any revolutionary movement behind the excesses. They could hardly be dignified by the term 'rebellion'.

Measures.—And in my opinion the Government erred in prosecuting the offenders for waging war. This view has caused unmerited or disproportionate suffering. The fine imposed on poor Ahmedabad was heavy and the manner of collecting it from the labourers was unnecessarily harsh and irritating. I doubt the justice of inflicting on the labourers a fine so large as 1,76,000 (one hundred and seventy-six thousand) rupees. The imposition of the cost from the farmers of Barejdi and from the Banias and Patidars of Nadiad was totally unjustified and even vindictive. I think that the introduction of Martial Law in Ahmedabad was also unjustified and its thoughtless administration resulted in the loss of several innocent lives.

At the same time, and subject to the reservations mentioned by me, I have no doubt that in the Bombay Presidency the authorities acted with considerable restraint at a time when the atmosphere was surcharged with mutual suspicion and the attempt at wrecking the train which was bringing the troops to restore order had naturally angered the authorities.

MR. GANDHI'S ORAL EVIDENCE

Examination by Lord Hunter.

Q. I take it, Mr. Gandhi, that you are the author of the Satyagraha movement.

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Will you explain it briefly?

A. It is a movement intended to replace methods of violence and a movement based entirely upon Truth. It is, as I have conceived it, an extension of the domestic law on the political field and my experience has led me to the conclusion that that movement and that alone can rid India of the possibility of violence spreading throughout the length and breadth of the land, for the redress of grievances.

Q. It was adopted by you in connection with the opposition to the Rowlatt Act. And in that connection you asked the people to sign the Satyagraha pledge.

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Was it your intention to enlist as many men as possible in the movement?

A. Yes, consistently with the principles of Truth and Non-violence. If I got a million men ready to act according to those principles, I would not mind enlisting them all.

Q. Is it not a movement essentially antagonistic to Government because you substitute the determination of the Satyagraha Committee for the will of the Government?

A. That is not the spirit in which the movement has been understood by the people.

Q. I ask you to look at it from the point of view of the Government. If you were a Governor yourself, what would you say to a movement that was started with the object of breaking those laws which your Committee determined?

A. That would not be stating the whole case of the Satyagraha doctrine. If I were in charge of the Government and brought face to face with a body who, entirely in search of Truth, were determined to seek redress from unjust laws without inflicting violence, I would welcome it and would consider that they were the best constitutionalists, and as a Governor, I would take them by my side as advisers who would keep me on the right path.

Q. People differ as to the justice or injustice of particular laws ?

A. That is the main reason why violence is eliminated and a Satyagrahi gives his opponent the same right of independence and feelings of liberty that he reserves to himself and he will fight by inflicting injuries on his person.

Lord Hunter.—I was looking at it from the point of view of the continuance of Government. Would it be possible to continue the Government if you had set up against the Government a body of men who would not accept the Government view but the view of an independent Committee.

A. I have found from my experience that it was possible to do so during eight years of continuous struggle in South Africa. I found General Smuts, who went through the whole of that campaign, at the end of it saying that if all conducted themselves as the Satyagrahis had done, they should have nothing to fear.

Q. But there was no such pledge in that campaign as is prescribed here?

A. Certainly there was. Every Satyagrahi was

bound to resist all those laws which he considered to be unjust and which were not of a criminal character, in order to bend the Government to the will of the people.

Q. I understand your vow contemplates breaking of laws which a Committee may decide.

A. Yes, my Lord. I want to make it clear to the committee that that part of the vow was meant to be a restraint on individual liberty. As I intended to make it a mass movement, I thought the constitution of some such Committee as we had appointed was necessary, so that no man should become a law unto himself, and therefore, we conceived the plan that the Committee would be able to show what laws might be broken.

Q. We hear that doctors differ, and even Satyagrahis might differ?

A. Yes, I found it so to my cost.

Q. Supposing a Satyagrahi was satisfied that a particular law was a just law and that the Committee did not obey this law, what is a Satyagrahi to do?

A. He is not bound to disobey that law. We had such Satyagrahis in abundance.

Q. Is it not rather a dangerous campaign?

A. If you will conceive the campaign as designed in order to rid the country of violence, then you will share with me the same concern for it. I think that at any cost a movement of this character should live in the country in a purified state.

Q. By your pledge are you not binding a man's conscience?

A. Not according to my interpretation of it. If my

interpretation of the pledge is found to be incorret, I shall mend my error if I have to start the movement again. (Lord H. No, No, Mr. Gandhi, I do not pretend to advise you.)

I wish I could disabuse the Committee of the idea that it is a dangerous doctrine. It is conceived entirely with the object of ridding the country of the idea of violence.

Lord Hunter here briefly detailed the circumstances preceding the passage of the Rowlatt Act, the widespread general Indian opposition to the Act. etc., and asked Mr. Gandhi to describe the essence of his objection to the legislation.

A. I have read the Rowlatt Committee's report to the end and the legislation foreshadowed in it, and I came to the conclusion that the legislation was not warranted by the facts produced by the Committee. I thought it was very restrictive of human liberty and that no self-respecting person or nation could allow such legislation. When I saw the debates in the Legislative Council, I felt that the opposition to it was universal. When I found the agitation against it, I felt that for me, as a self-respecting individual and a member of a vast Empire, there was no course left open but to resist that law to the utmost.

Q. So far as the objects of that legislation are concerned, have you any doubt that they are to put down revolutionary and anarchical crimes?

A. They are quite laudable objects.

Q. Your complaint, then, must be as regards the methods adopted?

A. Entirely.

Q. The method is, I understand, that greater power has been given to the executive than they enjoyed before.

A. That is so.

Q. But is it not the same power that the executive enjoyed under the Defence of India Act?

A. That is true, but that was essentially an emergency measure designed to secure the co-operation of everybody in order to put down any violence that may be offered by any section of the community in connection with the successful carrying on of the War. It was assented to with the greatest reluctance. The Rowlatt legislation is of a different character altogether, and now the experience of the working of the former Act has strengthened my objections to the Rowlatt Act.

Q. Mr. Gandhi, the Rowlatt legislation is only to operate if the local Government is satisfied that there is anarchy.

A. I would not, as a legislator, leave that power in the hands of an executive whom I have known to run mad in India at times.

Q. Then, really, your objection comes to this, that the Government of India, in the prosecution of a laudable object, adopted a wrong method. Therefore, is not the proper method of dealing with that, from a constitutional point of view, to endeavour to get the legislation remedied by satisfying Government of the inexpediency of it?

A. I approached on bended knees Lord Chelmsford, and pleaded with him and with every English officer I had the pleasure of meeting, and placed my views before them, but they said they were helpless, and that the Rowlatt Committee's recommendations had to be given effect to. We had exhausted all the methods open to us.

Q. If an opponent differs from you, you cannot satisfy

him all of a sudden. You must do it by degrees. Is it not rather a drastic way of attempting it by refusing to obey the law ?

A. I respectfully beg to differ from your Lordship. If I find that even my father has imposed upon me a law which is repugnant to my conscience, I think it is the least drastic course that I could adopt by respectfully telling him that I cannot obey it. By that course I do nothing but justice to my father, and, if I may say so without any disrespect to the Committee, I have myself followed that course with the greatest advantage and I have preached that ever since. If it is not disrespectful to say so to my father, it is not so to say so to a friend and, for that matter, to my Government.

Lord Hunter.—In the prosecution of your Satyagraha movement against the Rowlatt legislation you resolved upon a general *hartal* throughout India. That *hartal* was to be a day when no business was to be done and people were generally to indicate by their attitude that they disapproved of the Government's action. A *hartal* means a general cessation of business throughout the whole country. Would it not create a very difficult situation ?

A. Cessation for a great length of time would create a difficult situation.

Mr. Gandhi here explained how the observance of the *hartal* in some part of the country on the 30th March, and all over the country on the 6th April came about, not on account of any miscalculation, but on account of the people in one part coming to know of the Viceregal assent to the Act earlier than the people in other parts.

Q. You agree that the abstention from work should be entirely voluntary ?

A. Yes, entirely voluntarily, in the sense that persua-

sion on the day of the *hartal* would not be allowed, whereas persuasion by means of leaflets and other propaganda work on other days would be perfectly legitimate, so long as no physical force was employed.

Q. You disapprove of people interfering with *tongas* on the day of the *hartal*?

A. Certainly.

Q. You would not object to the police interfering in the case of such a disapprovable interference on the people's part?

A. I would not, if they acted with proper restraint and forbearance.

Q. But you agree that on the day of the *hartal* it was highly improper to jostle with other people and stop *tongas*?

A. From a Satyagrahi's standpoint I would hold it to be criminal.

Lord Hunter.—Your leading lieutenant in Delhi, Swami Shraddhananda—(Mr. Gandhi interrupting :—I would not call him my lieutenant, but an esteemed co-worker).—Did he write you a letter on the subject, and indicate to you that after what had occurred in Delhi and the Punjab, it was manifest that you could not present a general *hartal* without violence inevitably ensuing?

A. I cannot recall the contents of that letter. I think he went much further and said that it was not possible that the law-breaking campaign could be carried on with impunity among the masses. He did not refer to *hartal* proceeding. There was a difference of opinion between me and Swami Shraddhananda when I suspended Civil Disobedience. I found it necessary to suspend it because

I had not obtained sufficient control, to my satisfaction, over the people. What Swami Shraddhananda said was that Satyagraha could not be taken as a mass movement. But I did not agree with his view and I do not know that he is not converted to my view to-day. The suspension of Civil Disobedience was as much necessary as prosecution for offences against law. I would like the Committee to draw a sharp distinction between *hartal* and Civil Disobedience. (*Hartal* was designed to strike the imagination of the people and the Government; Civil Disobedience was a discipline for those who were to offer disobedience. I had no means of understanding the mind of India except by some such striking movement. *Hartal* was a proper indication to me how far I would be able to carry Civil Disobedience.

Q, If there is a *hartal* side by side with the preaching of Satyagraha, would it not be calculated to promote violence?

A. My experience is entirely to the contrary. It was an amazing scene for me to see people collected in their thousands—men, women and even little children and babies marching peacefully in procession. The peaceful *hartals* would not have been at all possible if Satyagraha was not preached in the right way.

But, as I have said, a *hartal* is a different thing from Civil Disobedience in practice.

In further reply to Lord Hunter, Mr. Gandhi recounted the incidents connected with his 'so-called arrest' at Palwal. He characterised the proceeding of his being detained at Palwal and turned back to Bombay under escort as, in form and in substance, an arrest and he

was surprised to find his arrest described in some quarters as his "supposed arrest." At Palwal he was served with an order prohibiting him from entering the Punjab and confining him to the Bombay Presidency. The Police Officer who served him with the order was exceedingly courteous to him. When he resolved to disregard the order prohibiting him from entering the Delhi Province, the Police Officer reasoned with him pointing out how much inconvenience would result in his being arrested at a small wayside station. When he proceeded to Palwal, he saw the Superintendent of Police, Delhi, with his officers and men. The officer placing his hand on his shoulder said, "Mr. Gandhi, I arrest you." He was asked to remove quickly his luggage from the train and to point out the men of his party who wished to accompany him. This was done. He was placed under the watch of some police constables; and to show that it was nothing else but a proper arrest Mr. Gandhi said, when he went to the side of the platform to clear his throat, an officer challenged him. He did not mean to imply that the officer did anything wrong. He was doing nothing more than his duty.

Mr. Gandhi then described how the officer arresting him had no knowledge as to how he was going to be proceeded with, how he was taken to Sawai Madhupur and there joined the Punjab Mail in which he was left in charge of Mr. Bowring, how at daybreak next day Mr. Bowring after consultation with an officer who had joined him told him that he would be free in Bombay.

Lord Hunter.—All that was required of you was that you were not to proceed to Delhi or the Punjab?

Mr. Gandhi.—No, by the time I was arrested, I had already committed an offence by proceeding to Palwal. Therefore, I was not asked to go back to Bombay, but I was escorted.

Lord Hunter.—Then it amounted to this, that in consequence of a Government order it was made clear to you that you would not be allowed to proceed to Delhi or the Punjab and that if you remained in the Bombay Presidency, you would be allowed perfect freedom?

Mr. Gandhi.—Yes.

Lord Hunter.—That is a little different from arresting you and throwing you into the jail. Is it not so, Mr. Gandhi?

Mr. Gandhi.—Nobody made that assertion. The only complaint against Government is that they had no business to turn me away from my mission of peace.

Lord Hunter.—If the Government honestly thought that it would be inexpedient to allow you to go to a place to propagate your doctrine which was already in an excited state on account of that doctrine, then would you object?

Mr. Gandhi.—From that standpoint, I have absolutely nothing to say.

Lord Hunter.—Subsequent to your arrest, serious incidents occurred in Delhi and the Punjab and also in Ahmedabad?

Mr. Gandhi.—Yes.

Lord Hunter.—Now, the only matters that we have got to deal with here are as regards Ahmedabad itself. In Ahmedabad, as we have been told, you enjoy great popularity among the mill workers?

Mr. Gandhi.—Yes.

Lord Hunter.—And your arrest seems to have caused great resentment on their part and led to the very unfortunate actions of the mob on April 10, 11 and 12 in Ahmedabad and Viramgam ?

Mr. Gandhi.—Yes.

Lord Hunter.—So far as those incidents are concerned, you have no personal knowledge of them ?

Mr. Gandhi.—No.

Lord Hunter.—I don't know whether there is anything that you can communicate to us in connection with those events to help us to form an opinion.

Mr. Gandhi.—I venture to present the opinion that I considered that the action of the mob, whether at Ahmedabad or at Viramgam, was totally unjustified, and I think that it was a very sad thing that they lost self-control. But, at the same time, I would like to say that the people among whom, rightly or wrongly, I was popular, were put to a severe test by Government. They should have known better. I do not say that the Government committed an unpardonable error of judgment and the mob committed no error. On the contrary, I hold that it was more unpardonable on the part of the mob than on the part of Government.

Proceeding, Mr. Gandhi narrated how he endeavoured to do what he could to repair the error. He placed himself entirely at the disposal of the authorities. He had a long interview with Mr. Pratt and other officials. He was to have held a meeting of the people on the 13th but he was told that it would not be possible to hold it that day, not on account of Colonel Fraser's order, because he was promised every assistance in connection with the

meeting, but that the notice of the meeting would not reach all the people that day. The meeting took place on the 14th. There he adumbrated what had happened. There he had to use the terms "organised" and "educated", both of which terms had been so much quoted against him and against the people. The speech was in Gujarati. Mr. Gandhi explained and hoped Sir Chimanlal Setalvad would bear him out on a reference to the Gujarati speech that the word only means those who can read and write, and that he used the word and expressed the opinion as he sensed the thing at that time.

He emphasised it was not a previous organisation that he meant; he only meant to say, and there could be no mistaking the actual words in his speech, that the acts were done in an *organised manner*. He further emphasised that he was speaking of Ahmedabad only, that he had then no knowledge of what had happened even at Viramgam, and that he would not retract a single statement from that speech. In his opinion, said Mr. Gandhi, violence was done in an organised manner. It cannot be interpreted to mean a deep-laid conspiracy. He laid special emphasis on the fact that, while he used these expressions, he was addressing the people and not the police authorities.

If Mr. Guider stated that a single name of the offenders was not forthcoming from him, he was entirely mistaken about his mission and had put an improper valuation upon the term "organisation." The crimes committed by the mob were the result of their being deluded by the wicked rumour of the arrest of Miss Anasuya. There was a class of half-educated people who possessed themselves

with false ideas from sources such as cinematographs and from silly novels and from political leaders. He knew that school. He had mixed with them and endeavoured to wean them. He had so far succeeded in his endeavours that there were to-day hundreds of people who had ceased to belong to the school of revolution.

Proceeding, Mr. Gandhi said he had now given the whole meaning of what he had said. He had never meant that there were University men behind the disturbances. He did not say they were incapable of those acts, but he was not aware of any highly educated man directing the mob.

Lord Hunter.—Do you imply that there was a common purpose on the part of the rioters.

Mr. Gandhi.—I don't say that. It would be exaggerating to say that, but I think the common purpose was restricted to two or three men or parties who instigated the crimes.

Q. Did the agitation take an anti-European character?

A. It was certainly an anti-Government movement. I would fain believe it was not anti-European, but I have not yet made up my mind as to that.

Lord Hunter.—I do not know whether you want to answer this or not. According to the Satyagraha doctrine, is it right that people who have committed crimes should be punished by the civil authorities?

Mr. Gandhi.—It is a difficult question to answer, because (through punishment) you anticipate pressure from outside. I am not prepared to say that it is wrong, but there is a better method. But I think, on the whole, it

would be proper to say that a Satyagrahi cannot possibly quarrel with any punishment that might be meted out to an offender and therefore he cannot be anti-Government in that sense.

Lord Hunter.—But apparently it is against the doctrine of satyagraha to give assistance to Government by way of placing the information that a Satyagrahi has that would lead to the conviction of offenders?

Mr. Gandhi.—According to the principles of Satyagraha, it is inconsistent for the simple reason that a Satyagrahi's business is not to assist the police in the method which is open to the police, but he helps the authorities and the police to make the people more law-abiding and more respectable to authority.

Lord Hunter.—Supposing a Satyagrahi has seen one of the more serious crimes committed in these riots in his own presence, Would there be no obligation on him to inform the police?

Mr. Gandhi.—Of course I answered that question to Mr. Guider before and I think I must answer it to Your Lordship. I don't want to misguide the youth of the country, but even then he cannot go against his own brother. When I say brother, I do not, of course, make any distinction of country or nationality. A satyagrahi is wholly independent of such a distinction. The Satyagrahi's position is somewhat similar to that of a counsel defending an accused. I have known criminals of the deadliest type and I may humbly claim to have been instrumental in weaning them from crimes. I should be forfeiting their confidence if I disclosed the name of a single man, But supposing I found myself wanting in

THE SATYAGRAHA MOVEMENT

weaning them, I would surely not take the next step to go and inform the police about them; I do not hesitate to say that for a Satyagrahi it is the straightest thing not to give evidence of a crime done even under his nose. But there can be only the rarest uses of this doctrine and even to-day I am not able to say whether I would not give evidence against a criminal whom I saw caught in the act.

Asked as regards his view of the general situation, Mr. Gandhi said the impression made on his mind was that there was martial law and that he thought that the Government acted under the greatest restraint and forbearance. He said he could understand troops in a train, which was attempted to be derailed, being infuriated and he would find it in his heart to excuse those troops of mad acts of fury. He thought that the terms in which the military notice was couched was entirely capable of misrepresentation. He thought the people were fired on without notice. There were, say nine men going along, and a tenth man met them not wanting to be the tenth man. It cannot be proper to fire on them and probably there was no use in giving notice to those who probably did not know of the military proclamation at all.

Asked as to his views on the work of the two tribunals, Mr. Gandhi said, in his opinion,

The Government erred in prosecuting the offenders for waging war. He must admit that the work of the tribunals was consistent with the laws of civilised justice. The sections under which the prosecutions were undertaken ought not to have been brought into use. That hasty view had caused unmerited and disproportionate suffering. The

fine imposed on poor Ahmedabad was heavy and the manner of collecting it from the labourers was unnecessarily harsh and irritating. And he ventured to differ there from Mr. Ambalal's opinion as expressed by Lord Hunter and he felt that Mr. Ambalal had erred grievously against his people. He thought the action of Government in imposing the additional police on Nadiad and Barejadi was totally unjustified. The arguments urged by the Collector of Nadiad for inflicting that fine were totally irrelevant and vindictive. He was satisfied that the people of Nadiad were not in league with those who went to derail the train but gave every assistance to Government to trace the offenders and got a handsome acknowledgment and compliment from the Collector for their assistance.

EXAMINATION BY MR. JUSTICE RANKIN.

Mr. Justice Rankin said he wanted to get some dates from Mr. Gandhi. In reply to him, Mr. Gandhi said the Satyagraha vow was taken on the third week of February and agreed that the Rowlatt Bill No. 2 had not yet been passed.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—But before it was passed, the country was ringing with suggestions as to methods of protest against it and one of the forms of protest suggested was refusal to pay the revenue?

A. Yes.

Q. The orders passed by Magistrate were also to be disobeyed?

A. I opposed the proposal. I had asked the people in observing the *hartal* or Civil Disobedience that all police orders should be scrupulously carried out.

Mr. Justice Rankin asked Mr. Gandhi if he could substantiate his statement by any of his public declarations and Mr. Gandhi agreed to furnish what documentary evidence there was in his possession.

Q. In going to Delhi, it was not your intention to come into collision with the authorities.

A. No. I had received a letter from Dr. Satyapal, and Swami Shraddhanandji had asked me to go to Delhi as the people there were getting unamenable.

Q. He was not inviting you to pacify the people who had got out of his hands, but to promote the Satyagraha movement ?

A. No, not to promote the movement. He said, 'I have failed,' and that I should go to pacify people there. I was not going there to disobey Government laws for the purpose of the Satyagraha vow. I was proceeding to help the authorities.

Here Mr Justice Rankin asked Mr. Gandhi to supply any documentary evidence in his possession, as to the pacific intention of his mission.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—Mr. Gandhi, you say in your speech of the 14th April that the action of the mob prevented you from carrying out your idea of going again to Delhi for re-arrest. It was not a passing thought, I suppose ?

A. It was not a passing thought. It was my intention.

Q. What was your object in seeking re-arrest ?

A. My object was to seek imprisonment again and again until the objectionable Act was removed.

Q. That is not the object of a Satyagrahi as I understand it.

A. It is not always. I did it in order to invite self-suffering.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—Was it your idea that that would inflame the country and be effective in removing the legislation?

Mr. Gandhi.—Not at all. If it was, I would have proceeded to Delhi straight away. I had no idea of what had occurred at Amritsar and elsewhere and had urgent messages from Ahmedabad the day after my arrival in Bombay.

Mr. Gandhi then explained why Civil Disobedience was suspended, why he again thought of starting it, but yielding to the desire of Lord Chelmsford conveyed through the Government of Bombay, he desisted from re-starting it. He emphasised that during the interval various attempts were made to educate the people and there was even devised another vow by which people were asked to pledge themselves to the Truth part and Non-violence part of the former vow.

Q. Do you think that for India as a whole, by a misinterpretation of your doctrine, there has been an undue tendency to sympathise with lawlessness?

A. I don't think that it is so.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—Pardon the question, Mr. Gandhi. Do you feel having done anything to damage the law-abiding instincts of the people in India?

Mr. Gandhi.—I feel guilty of having temporarily damaged that instinct in certain people.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—There are certain parts in India, e.g., the Punjab, where people were more liable to misinterpret your doctrine?

Mr. Gandhi.—No. There were certain people so liable to misinterpret. As to the Punjab, I have found there people who can best understand Satyagraha, and wherever I have gone I have met people who sincerely regret the excesses.

Mr. Justice Rankin.—You said, Mr. Gandhi, finding the laws by a Committee was meant as a restraint. Did you intend that each Province would have a separate committee?

A. Yes, each was to have a separate Committee. But I was made President everywhere so that we should have the same policy everywhere, But, of course, I did contemplate the contingency of different laws being broken in different places,

Mr. Gandhi then explained the difference between Passive Resistance and Civil Disobedience and said Passive Resistance did not exhaust the methods of protest. X

BY SIR CHIMANLAL SETALVAD.

Sir Chimanlal.—With regard to your Satyagraha doctrine, so far as I understand it, it involves the pursuit of Truth and in that pursuit you invite suffering on yourself and do not cause violence to anybody else.

Mr. Gandhi.—Yes, sir.

Q. However honestly a man may strive in his search for Truth his notions of Truth may be different from the notions of others. Who then is to determine the truth?

A. The individual himself would determine that.

Q. Different individuals would have different views as to Truth. Would that not lead to confusion?

A. I do not think so.

Q. Honestly striving after Truth is different in every case.

A. That is why the non-violence part was a necessary corollary. Without that there would be confusion and worse,

Q. Must not the person wanting to pursue Truth be of high moral and intellectual equipment?

A. No. It would be impossible to expect that from everyone. If A has evolved a truth by his own efforts which B. C. and others are to accept, I should not require them to have the equipment of A.

Q. Then it comes to this, that a man comes to a decision and others of lower intellectual and moral equipment would have to blindly follow him.

A. Not blindly. All I wish to urge is that each individual, unless he wants to carry on his pursuit of Truth independently, needs to follow some one who has determined truth.

Q. Your scheme involves the determination of truth by people of high moral and intellectual equipment and a large number of people may follow them blindly, being themselves unable to arrive at similar conclusions by reason of their lower intellectual equipment.

A. I would exact from them nothing more than I would expect from an ordinary being.

Q. I take it that the strength of the propaganda must depend on the number of its followers.

A. No. In Satyagraha success is possible even if there is only one Satyagrahi of the proper stamp.

Q. Mr. Gandhi, you said you do not consider yourself a perfect Satyagrahi yet. The large mass of people are then even less so.

A. No, I do not consider myself as an extraordinary man. There may be people more capable of determining, truth than myself. Forty thousand Indians in South Africa, totally uncultured, came to the conclusion that they could be Satyagrahis; and if I could take you through those thrilling scenes in the Transvaal, you will be surprised to hear what restraint your countrymen in South Africa exhibited.

Q. But there you were all unanimous.

A. I have more solidity of opinion here than in South Africa.

Q. But there you had a clear-cut issue, not here.

A. Here too we have a clear-cut issue, *viz.*, the Rowlatt Act.

Mr. Gandhi then explained how he presented Satyagraha as an instrument of infinitely greater power than violence.

Q. Does not suffering and going on suffering require extraordinary self-control?

A. No, no extraordinary self-control is required. Every mother suffers. Your countrymen, I submit, have got such a control and they have exhibited that in a very large measure.

Q. Take Ahmedabad. Did they exhibit control here?

A. All I say is throughout India where you find these isolated instances of violence, you will find a very large number of people who exercised self-restraint. Ahmedabad and other places show that we had not attained proper mastery over self. The Kaira people in the midst of grave provocation last year acted with the greatest self-restraint.

Q. Do you mean to say these acts of violence were mere accidents ?

A. Not accidents, But they were rare and would be rarer for a clear conception of Satyagraha. The country, I think, has sufficiently well realised the doctrine to warrant a second trial. I do feel sure that the country is all the purer and better for having gone through the the fire of Satyagraha.

Q. Ordinarily your doctrine contemplates co-operation with the Government and elimination of race-hatred and inviting self-suffering. Does not suffering create ill will ?

A. It is contrary to my thirty years' experience that people have by suffering been filled with any ill will against the Government. In South Africa, after a bitter struggle the Indians have lived on the best of terms with the Government, and Gen. Smuts was the recipient of an address which was voluntarily voted by the Indians.

Q. Is it possible to take part in the movement without taking the Satyagraha vow ?

A. I would ask them to take part in the non-Civil Resistance part of the movement. The masses unless they took the pledge were not to do the Civil Disobedience part of the pledge. For those who were not civil resisters, therefore, another vow was devised asking people to follow Truth at all costs and to refrain from violence. I had suspended Civil Resistance then ; and as it is open to a leader to emphasise one part of the vow, I eliminated the Civil Resistance part which was not for that reason suited to the people and placed the Truth part before them.

Sir Chimanlal Setalvad then referred to the question whether disobedience of the Rowlatt Act also was contemplated in the vow and referred to Mrs. Besant's difference with Mr. Gandhi.

Mr. Gandhi said that he had heard in Bombay that she had taken the vow less the Committee part of it. She said she had not done so.

Q. Did she not point out that to disobey the Rowlatt Act one would have to be an anarchist?

A. She has certainly advanced that ground.

Mr. Gandhi explained that the determining consideration was that the Rowlatt Act would not lend itself to active disobedience in a systematic manner.

Q. Is not the underlying idea embarrassment of Government.

A. Certainly not. A Satyagrahi relies not upon embarrassment but upon self-suffering for securing relief.

Q. Would not ordered government be impossible?

A. Ordered government cannot be impossible if totally inoffensive people break the laws. But I would certainly make government impossible, if I found it had taken leave of its senses.

Q. In your message you ask people to refrain from violence and still violence occurred. Does it not show that the ordinary mind finds it very difficult to practise the theory of non-violence?

A. After having used methods of violence for years it is difficult for them to practise abstention.

In reply to a question whether he had any evidence in support of the statement that the disturbances were organised, Mr. Gandhi replied in the affirmative and said he had no objection to place the materials he had before

the Committee, although he would not disclose the names of the persons concerned.

Mr. Gandhi said they did not suggest any destruction of life but only of property. There was some organisation arranged on the 10th and on the 11th. He said he had the testimony of those who were told to do violence, and of those who did so, and of those who were witnesses of the scenes. He said he had direct evidence, he had people coming to him to surrender swords in their possession, but they had not the courage to do so. He said he could identify some of the informants, but it was impossible for him to identify all, as, for instance, there were people from neighbouring villages who came to him, and said they regretted what they had done and that what they had done was from pure love for me.

Asked as to how he could determine whether what they said was the truth, Mr. Gandhi said, he thought he was capable of discriminating an untruthful statement from a truthful one. They took advantage of the temper of the people and put those ideas into their heads. The Kaira derailment was committed by two or three individuals. They were drunkards, and he could not say that the act was a deliberately organised one. It was his conviction that the people in the town had no knowledge of the crime, and if they had, they would have prevented it. His view was based on the testimony of those for whom he had high regard. He could not tell whether the person convicted of the crime was the same who committed it, because he had not learnt his name.

Proceeding, Mr. Gandhi said he suspended the Civil Disobedience movement, because he realised that the

movement as a mass movement under present circumstances was not advisable. He would not expect the people to realise the inwardness of the Satyagraha movement but he would expect them to realise that it was better for them, if they could not join the movement, at least to refrain from violence.

Here Sir Chimanlal asked Mr. Gandhi to read from a leaflet of his, entitled 'When will Satyagraha be resumed?' and asked if, when he was saying that they should be ready to resume Satyagraha because the military dispositions would then be complete, he was not desiring that military dispositions should be kept in all parts of the country in order that people may have the pleasure to indulge in breaking laws. Mr. Gandhi said that that was not the interpretation warranted by his words. He would not be guilty of saying such a thing. He did not re-start the campaign on the 1st of July as he had expected, much to the disappointment of his co-workers, only because the Viceroy and the Governor of Bombay asked him whether he wanted India to be an armed camp and to suspend the Satyagraha movement if he did not want her to be so, and he suspended it.

Asked as to the fine imposed on the Ahmedabad workmen, Mr. Gandhi said the manner of collection was wholly bad, the principle of taxation was bad and the time fixed for collection was inopportune for collection. The fine was imposed in certain cases upon those who had nothing to do with the disturbances. He added that he was not going to say anything regarding the exemptions, and that he was not prepared to dispute the discretion vested in the authorities. He said he would not be fair if he did

not pay his testimony to the handsome manner in which the Collector of Ahmedabad had taken the measures he had thought necessary.

BY PANDIT JAGAT NARAIN

Q. I presume, Mahatmaji, you are not against the Government's taking measures to put down anarchy?

A. Of course, not. But anarchical crimes can be punished under the ordinary law.

Q. How was it then that you objected to the Rowlatt Legislation?

A. My fundamental objection to the Rowlatt Act is that it constitutes a libel on the whole Indian nation.

Q. But you know there are safeguards?

A. As to the safeguards, I can say from experience they are not merely illusory but dangerous traps. The safeguards are but a delusion and make the executive still more irresponsible.

Q. It is alleged that the Satyagraha movement would embarrass the Government. Are you not afraid of any such result of your movement?

A. The Satyagraha movement is not started with the intention of embarrassing the Government, while ordinary political agitation is often started with that object. If a Satyagrahi finds his activities resulting in embarrassing the Government, he will not hesitate to face it.

Q. But you will agree with me that every political agitation depends for its success on the number of followers?

A. I do not regard the force of numbers as necessary in a just cause, and in such a cause every man, be he high or low, can have his remedy.

Q. But you would certainly try to have as many men in your movement as possible ?

A. Not exactly so. A Satyagrahi depends only on truth and his capacity to suffer for truth.

Q. But in politics, Mahatmaji, how can a single man's voice be heard ?

A. That is exactly what I have been attempting to disprove.

Q. Do you believe that an English officer will take any notice of isolated attempts ?

A. Why, that is my experience. Lord Bentinck became an ordinary Mr. at the instance of Keshav Chandra Sen.

Q. Oh, you cite an example of an extraordinary man.

A. Men of ordinary abilities also can develop monamality. No doubt I regard illiteracy among my people as deplorable and I consider it necessary to educate them, but it is not at all impossible to imbibe the Satyagraha principle in an absolutely illiterate man. This is my long-standing experience.

Here Mr. Gandhi briefly cleared the distinction between *hartal* and Satyagraha. *Hartal* was no integral part of Satyagraha. It should be resorted to only when necessary. He tried and tried it successfully in connection with the deportation of Mr. Horniman and Khilafat movement.

Q. You can resort to no other remedy to oppose the irresponsible foreign officials, and that is why you have started this movement. Is it not ?

A. I cannot say that with certainty. I can conceive the necessity of Satyagraha in opposition to the would-

be full responsible self-government. Our ministers can never claim to defend themselves on the score of their ignorance, whereas such a defence is available to-day for the English officers.

Q. But with all the rights of self-government we shall be able to dismiss the ministers.

A. I cannot feel on that point so assured for ever. In England, it often happens that ministers can continue in the executive even though they lose all the confidence of the public. The same thing may happen here too, and therefore I can imagine a state of things in this country which would need Satyagraha even under Home Rule.

Q. Would you think that there should be no unrest coming after the Satyagraha movement ?

A. Not only I do not think so, I would be disappointed if there were no unrest in case myself and Anasuyabai were arrested. But that unrest will not take the shape of violence. It pains a Satyagrahi to see others suffering and Satyagrahis will follow each other to jail. I do wish for such unrest.

Q. On your return to Bombay on the 11th April, why did you go to Pydhonie ?

A. I went there as there was danger of violence breaking out.

Q. It is said that the people there refused to listen to your advice.

A. It would not at all be correct to say that the crowd refused to listen to my advice. Those who heard me followed my advice implicitly.

Q. I have a report before me to the effect that you pretend to be ill although your steps are quick.

A. All that I can say, is that it is all untrue.

Q. The report further says that you were so very terrified that you ran away and concealed yourself in a house.

A. That too is a lie. I was in the crowd to the last. I personally saw the charge of the mounted police on the crowd. I went to Mr. Griffiths to talk to him on this very thing.

BY Mr. KEMP

Q. You say that martial law was not at all necessary in Ahmedabad ?

A. Yes, that is my opinion.

Q. But, Mr. Gandhi, if the military officers said it was necessary, what will you say to that ?

A. From the facts in my possession I concluded that they did not warrant such an order.

Q. You say some innocent men were were killed.

A. That is my deliberate opinion.

Q. Can you say you have got any positive proof for that ?

A. I have got proof enough to satisfy me.

Q. Did you write to Mr. Chatfield about this ?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did he ask you to send the complainants to him ?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you then take any steps ?

A. I took no steps because martial law was withdrawn on the very day I wrote to Mr. Chatfield. I consider Mr. Chatfield a noble officer. In very few officers have I seen his honesty and straightforwardness. I should be very sorry to say anything that would amount

to a criticism of his conduct. I see his nobility even in his mistakes. But I should like you not to press this point further. I have granted that the sobriety with which the Bombay Government acted during the month of April leaves nothing to complain of.

But when I have to analyse the whole situation, it is my duty to point the mistakes also with all the humility I can command. And I have done it. I do not want to make it a serious complaint by emphasising the fact that some innocent people were killed.

Mr. Kemp : I accept, Mr. Gandhi, that your evidence is fair and candid. I don't want to put you any more question. *

SOME PROOFS OF THE UNIVERSALITY OF SATYAGRAHA.

(June 23, 1920.)

It may be long before the law of love will be recognised in international affairs. The machineries of governments stand between and hide the hearts of one people from those of another. Yet if only we watched the latest international developments in Europe and Eastern Asia with an eye to essentials, we could see how the world is moving steadily to realise that between nation and nation, as between man and man, force has failed to solve problems, but that the economic sanction of non-co-operation is far more mighty and conclusive than armies and navies.

* [Mr. Gandhi was further examined by Mr. Jivanlal Desai and Sahebzada Sultan Ahmed Khan. Which have been omitted as they have not appeared in *Young India*.]

The victories of war have only thrown fresh burdens on the nations that emerged out of the struggle as apparent victors. The food and the industries of the defeated nations are a source of anxiety as much to the victors as to themselves. All the ingenuity of the governments of the Allied nations is directed to how, without detriment to the glory of the victors, they can make the vanquished people economically solvent, happy, and willing to work to keep the world going. Reading between the lines of the brief telegram about the American Republican party's international programme, one can see that the Far West is beginning to realise that the ultimate sanction of a league of nations should be, not the vicious chain of the might of arms again, but the might of international 'out-lawry', i.e., non-co-operation of the nations. From this it would be an easy step to the complete recognition of the law of love. Till a new energy is harnessed and put on wheels, the captains of the older energies will treat the innovation as theoretical, impractical, idealistic, and so on. We may be certain that the steam-engineer was laughed at by the horse-dealer, till he saw that even horses could be transported by the steam engine. The electrical engineer was, no doubt, called a faddist and a mad man in steam engine circles, till work was actually done over the wires. It may take long to lay the wires for international love, but the sanction of international non-co-operation in preference to continued physical compulsion, as appears to have been conceived by the Republican party of America, is a distinct progress towards the ultimate and real solution.

The most striking news in this connection is a rumour

of contemplated action in regard to the Irish situation. The "Observer" gives currency to the belief that the British Ministry is considering, as an alternative of martial law in Ireland, a policy of non-co-operation. The disaffected interior of Ireland is to be entirely ignored until it comes to its senses. There would be no police, no troops, no trade, no education, no distribution of revenue, no railways. There would be complete administrative boycott. The beauty of Satyagraha, of which non-co-operation is but a chapter, is that it is available to either side in a fight; that it has checks that automatically work for the vindication of truth and justice for that side, whichever it may be, that has truth and justice in preponderating measure. It is as powerful and faithful a weapon in the hand of the capitalist as in that of the labourer. It is as powerful in the hands of the government, as in that of the people, and will bring victory to the government, if people are misguided or unjust, as it will win the battle for the people if the government be in the wrong. Quick disorganisation and defeat are bound to be the fate of bolstered up cases and artificial agitations, if the battle is fought with Satyagraha weapons. Suppose the people are unfit to rule themselves, or are unwilling to sacrifice for a cause, then, no amount of noise will bring them victory in non-co-operation. If the government be a good government, just, on the whole, and necessary for the people, and the grievance be false or unreal or is based on misconception or is not of such measure as to weigh against the virtues of the government in other vital respects, then non-co-operation has only to be adopted on either side, and, without rancour or

bloodshed the question will automatically be settled with unerring precision and justice. It may not be generally known but it has long been maintained by Mr. Gandhi that the Satyagrahic weapon of non-cooperation is as available to government against the people, as to the people against the government. The action said to be contemplated in regard to the Irish disorders would, if true, be a beautiful illustration of the universality of the principles of Satyagraha.

“RING OUT THE OLD, RING IN THE NEW”

(November 5, 1919)

It is difficult to strike the last year's balance. The War has ended but with little result. The hopes it nourished have remained unfulfilled. The Peace which was expected to be a permanent one, has turned out to be one in name. The war which was greater than the *Mahabharat* war has been proved to be but a prelude to a still greater war. Widespread discontent all over France, America and England after the war—enough to bewilder one. All that has followed seems to be a huge enigma. Here in India we are faced with despair everywhere. It was confidently hoped that at the close of the war India would get something substantial, but the hope turned out to be false. For aught we know the reforms may not come. Even if they do, they will be worthless. The Congress-League Scheme, then the Delhi Congress Scheme and subsequent schemes are now airy nothings. We have to wait and see. The Punjab has been a scene

of most revolting episodes. Innocent lives have been lost. There reigned a reign of terror. The gulf between the rulers and the ruled has been widened. In these matters it is impossible to strike a correct balance. What is the sum total on the credit side? Or is there something to be debited, and if so what? Or is it that there is no credit side at all and we have simply to sum up the debit figures?

Was there any silver lining to such a thick, dark cloud of despair? The sun of Satyagraha dawned all over India on the 6th April. The clouds were scattered and the rays could be distinctly seen. But the sun underwent an eclipse in the Punjab and Ahmedabad and its shadows are still haunting us. And yet Satyagraha is again seen dawning on most minds, though slowly. There was *hartal* in many parts amid perfect peace and quiet. The Faithful passed that day in fasting and prayer. The Hindus participated in Moslems' mourning, strengthened the latter's hopes and the bonds of union with them. It may now be very difficult to break the bonds.

If some one were to ask, "What was the greatest event of the last year?", we would unhesitatingly say, "It was the acceptance of Satyagraha,—however slightly—and consciously or unconsciously, both by the rulers and the ruled." And in proof of the statement we would cite *October the 17th*.

(The hope of India lies in Satyagraha. And what is Satyagraha? It has often been described. But just as the sun cannot be *fully* described even by the myriad-tongued Sheshnaga, so also the sun of Satyagraha cannot be adequately described. And though we always see the sun but know really very little of it, even so we do ever

seem to see the sun of Satyagraha but we know precious little about it.)

The spheres of Satyagraha are Swadeshi, Social Reforms and Political Reform. And in so far as these are based on Satyagraha, so far only, and no further, is their permanence assured. The way of Satyagraha is distant from the beaten track and it is not always easy to discover it. Few have ventured along that path and the footprints on it are few and far between and indistinct, and hence the people's dread of it. And still we clearly find people taking that course, be it ever so slowly.

He to whom Satyagraha means nothing more than Civil Disobedience has never understood Satyagraha. No doubt the rigid interpretation of Satyagraha does include within its meaning Civil Disobedience. But only he who has mastered the art of obedience to law knows the art of disobedience to law. Only he who thoroughly knows how to construct may destroy. (The poet has sung,

"The path of Truth is the path of the brave,
It is beyond the power of the cowards.")

Swadeshi is Satyagraha. It is beyond the power of cowardly spirits to observe or to propagate Swadeshi. It is impossible for a coward to foster Hindu-Moslem Unity. It takes anyone but a cowardly Mussalman to receive a wound from a Hindu's dagger and vice versa and to preserve his mental balance. If both could muster this much forbearance, Swarajya would be instantaneously obtained. There is none to forbid us the path of Satyagraha, and both Swadeshi and Hindu-Moslem Unity being in this essence religious, India would incidentally perform an act of religion. This then is our prayer for the New Year :—

“Lord, lead India towards the path of Truth, this doing teach her the religion of Swadeshi, and knit the Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis, Christians and Jews living in India closer together.”

THE “LEADER” MISLED

(January 28th, 1920)

The *Leader* in its anxiety to make out a case against the Satyagraha movement from Mr. Gandhi's admissions, seems to have grievously neglected to consider his written statement and evidence as a whole. Pouncing upon his admission of his ‘having temporarily damaged the feeling of respect for law in some people’, it has tried to prove how the Satyagraha movement would have led to deplorable or evil results and asks: “Did not Mr. Gandhi start the movement prematurely? Were all the other and milder constitutional means for securing the repeal of the Rowlatt Act exhausted before he launched his movement?” Having satisfied itself that the movement was premature it deviates into a hackneyed homily on the necessity of “combining moral virtues with other high qualities of head and heart to promote public interest” and it concludes by saying that ordinary people are not fit to apply the principles of Satyagraha doctrine rightly.

Now, every one of these objections has been completely answered in Mr. Gandhi's statement and the evidence before the Hunter Committee. As regards the charge of starting his campaign prematurely Mr. Gandhi says, “I approached on bended knees Lord Chelmsford, and plead-

ed with him and with every English officer I had the pleasure of meeting and placed my views before them, but they said they were helpless.....We had exhausted all the methods open to us." All the popular members in the Supreme Council had condemned the legislation. The nation had expressed itself as one man through the innumerable meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country and the cause was not 'controversial' in the least. Can our contemporary point out what 'other and milder constitutional means' were left untried? If any were so left other leaders would certainly have tried them when Mr. Gandhi gave them an opportunity to do so by suspending Civil Resistance. It is more than six months since Mr. Gandhi wrote in his reply to Mr. Abdul Aziz, as follows :

"If you have a remedy other than Civil Resistance by all means apply it and if you are successful, Civil Resistance falls away automatically. The period of suspension is the period during which you and all the leaders who dread or disapprove of Civil Resistance can work with all your might to bring about the desired result."

Secondly, from a mere statement of Mr. Gandhi that his propaganda resulted in 'temporarily damaging the feeling of respect for law in some people' the *Leader* jumps to the conclusion that 'if it had been persisted in for a sufficient time it would have affected a larger number of persons with even probably more deplorable results.' The *Leader* even fears that 'the spirit of lawlessness in the people as a whole' would have been created. This conclusion is supported neither by facts nor by logic. On the contrary, it was Satyagraha that prevent-

YOUNG INDIA

ed the more deplorable results which would have followed in the wake of the bitter agitation provoked by the Government's obduracy. No doubt, Satyagraha has undermined the fear of law as law, in the minds of people, but it has created in them an intelligent and deep respect for law and order as being the basis of all social stability and advancement. "A Satyagrahi ever obeys the laws of the State to which he belongs not out of fear of the sanctions but because he considers them to be good for the welfare of society. And when on rare occasions he breaks the law to maintain his self-respect and honour he does so openly and civilly. His actions, therefore, cannot embarrass the Government. The experience of Kaira and Champaran and the brave stand of the Indians in South Africa are, we believe, an ample proof of the self-restraining influence of Satyagraha. Even in the matter of the Rowlatt Act agitation the country as a whole presented an exemplary restraint in spite of the gravest provocation and wherever violence did take place the Satyagrahis were invariably and consistently on the side of law and order. The disturbances occurred not, as the *Leader* thinks, because Satyagraha was preached but because Satyagraha was not sufficiently preached and because the people had not developed the capacity 'to stand *any* amount of suffering and *provocation*.'

In the face of all these facts will the *Leader* still persist in regarding Satyagraha, which is nothing but truth and Ahimsa, as being unsuited to be preached to the masses? If it does, it will merely betray its want of faith in human nature and the power of good over evil.

THE 6TH OF APRIL AND THE 13TH

BY M. K. GANDHI.

(*March 10, 1920,*)

(It is impossible for us to forget the 6th. of April which vitalized the whole of India and the 13th. of April which by the spilling of innocent blood has made the Punjab a place of pilgrimage for the whole of India. The 6th. of April saw the advent of Satyagrah. One may dissent from the civil-disobedience part of it but no one can dissent from the essential doctrine of truth and love or non-injury. With Satya combined with Ahimsa you can bring the world to your feet. Satyagrah in its essence is nothing but the introduction of truth and gentleness in the political, i. e. the national life. And whether one takes the Satyagrah pledge or not, there can be no doubt that the spirit of Satyagrah has pervaded the masses. Any way that is my experience of thousands of the Punjabis I met throughout my tour in the Punjab.

The 6th of April again saw the inauguration of a definite plan of Hindu-Muslim unity and Swadeshi.

It was the 6th of April which broke the spirit underlying the Rowlatt Act and made it a dead letter. The 13th of April saw not merely the terrific tragedy but in that tragedy Hindu-Muslim blood flowed freely in a mingled stream and sealed the compact.

How to commemorate or celebrate these two great national events ! I venture to suggest that those who will, should devote the 6th April next to fast (twenty four hours' abstention from food) and prayer and that all over

India at 7 P. M. public meetings should be held praying for the repeal of the Rowlatt Act and expressing the national belief that there will be no peace in the land till that Act is repealed. That the Act is a dead letter is not enough. Either it is a disgrace or it is not. If it is, the Act must be repealed. The repeal before the reforms will be a token of good will on the part of the Government.

The whole of the week beginning from the 6th should be devoted to some work connected with the tragedy of the 13th. I therefore venture further to suggest that the week should be devoted to the collecting of funds for the Jallianwala Bagh memorial, it being remembered that the sum to be collected is ten lacs of rupees. Each village or town can devise its own plan of collection, guarding against misappropriation and fraud. The collection should be finished by the evening of the 12th April.

Then the 13th. That day of days should be devoted to fasting and prayer. It should be free from ill-will or anger. We want to cherish the memory of the innocent dead. We do not want to remember the wickedness of the deed. The nation will rise by readiness to sacrifice not by preparing to revenge. On that day I would also have the nation to remember the mass excesses and feel penitent for them. We close the week by meetings throughout India to pass resolutions urging the Government, both Imperial and Indian, to take effective steps to render a repetition of the tragedy impossible.

I would further urge that during the week each one does his or her best in his or her own person to realize more fully than ever the principles of Satyagrah, Hindu-

Muslim unity and Swadeshi. In order to emphasise Hindu-Muslim unity I would advise joint meetings of Hindus and Mahomedans on Friday the 12th April at 7 P. M. urging that the Khilafat question be decided in accordance with the just Muslim sentiments.

Thus this national week should be a week of purification, self examination, sacrifice, exact discipline and expression of cherished national sentiments. There should be no trace of bitterness, no violence of language but absolute fearlessness and firmness.

Should there not also be a Hartal on the 6th, and the 13th. My answer is an emphatic no. This week is a Satyagrah week for those who believe in truth and non-violence. The Hartal of the 6th was a Satyagrah Hartal in the sense that it was a prelude to Satyagrah. The Hartal of the 6th April last though it was spontaneous was not altogether free from undue pressure during the course of the day in the way of asking people not to use carriages etc. I would therefore not advise Hartal at all for this week of discipline and penance. Moreover Hartal must not be made cheap. It must be only for rare occasions.

I respectfully trust that all parties and all classes will see their way to take their full share in the observances of the national week and make it an event for the true and definite progress in national awakening.

REFLECTIONS ON SATYAGRAHA WEEK

(March 24, 1920)

This national week will soon be upon us. We trust that it will be worthy of the occasion which it is to commemorate. The chief item of work which can be measured and which will be an acid test of our genuineness and feeling for the Punjab will be the collection of a fund to pay for the memorial site for commemorating the memory of the martyrs of the 13th April last. To collect ten lacs from a population of thirty crores is not a difficult task if suitable workers can be found. If rich and well-known ladies and gentlemen could be persuaded to take up the work, it could be finished inside the week. The proper thing no doubt will be to collect *pro rata* from every province. We hope to give such a list next week. But each province should try to collect as much more as it can, than its share. It would not matter if we succeed in collecting more. Ten lacs is not the highest sum required. It is the minimum. Every one therefore is expected to subscribe liberally.

*

*

*

*

Then there is the fasting and prayer. This is a hoary institution. A genuine fast cleanses body, mind and soul. It crucifies the flesh and to that extent sets the soul free. A sincere prayer can work wonders. It is an intense longing of the soul for its even greater purity. Purity thus gained when it is utilized for a noble purpose becomes a prayer. The mundane use of *Gayatri*, its repetition for healing the sick, illustrates the meaning we have given to prayer. When the same *Gayatri* *Jab* is

performed with a humble and concentrated mind in an intelligent manner in times of national difficulties and calamities, it becomes a most potent instrument for warding off danger. There can be no greater mistake than to suppose that the recitation of the *Gayatri*, the *namaz* or the Christian prayer are superstitions fit to be practised by the ignorant and the credulous. Fasting and prayer therefore are a most powerful process of purification and that which purifies necessarily enables us the better to do our duty and to attain our goal. If therefore fasting and prayer seem at times not to answer, it is not because there is nothing in them but because the right spirit is not behind them.

* * * *

A man who fasts and gambles away the whole of the day as do so many on *Janmashtami* day, naturally, not only obtains no result from the fast in the shape of greater purity but such a dissolute fast leaves him on the contrary degraded. A fast to be true must be accompanied by a readiness to receive pure thoughts and determination to resist all satan's temptations. Similarly a prayer to be true has to be intelligible and definite. One has to identify oneself with it. Counting beads with the name of Allah on one's lips whilst the mind wanders in all directions is worse than useless. We therefore hope that the coming week of dedication to national fasting and prayer will become a universal reality and not merely a formal observation.

* * * *

The magnificent spectacle of tens of thousands of Mahomedans going to Jumma Musjids in different parts

of India and offering heart-felt prayers for the triumph of truth did more than anything else to bring a just solution within the bounds of possibility. We would have no hesitation in guaranteeing a proper solution of the Khilafat question purely on the strength of prayer. We need not be told that the argument in favour of prayer cuts both ways, as it is open as much to our enemy as to us to pray. But that would be an argument not against prayer but against allowing the result to affect our valuation of prayer. One may not make terms with God. It is enough to know that prayer has played from times immemorial a most important part in the evolution of nations as well as individuals. May the Satyagrah week witness a revival of the institutions of fasting and prayer in all their original glory and splendour.

VIOLENCE *versus* NON-VIOLENCE.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 24, 1920.)

The Khilafat day has come and gone. It was a great success and a complete triumph of Satyagrah, i. e., not civil disobedience but truth and non-violence. No *hartal* has been so voluntary as that of the 19th March in that all the canvassing that ever took place was before the 19th. It was an example of wonderful self-restraint on the part of the Committee not to have called out the mill-hands. The Committee deserves the highest praise for its efficient management and for the definite recognition of voluntarism. If the people continue to show the disci-

pline and self-restraint shown on the 19th and add thereto in an equal measure the spirit of self-sacrifice, nothing can prevent the full fruition of our hopes regarding Khilafat. Nobody could have believed a year ago the possibility of peace being observed by the fanatical element among the Mahomedans on a matter of life and death to them and on a day of no business for the idlers. But there can be no idleness when there is prayer. All were enjoined not to quarrel, not to be angry, but to pray for the right to be done. It is true that all did not definitely pray, but the spirit of prayer was abroad and it dominated the people rather than the spirit of revenge, anger, excitement and so we had the amazing spectacle of the *hartal* day passing off like an ordinary day when everybody expects peace to be observed. The vast meeting of Bombay attended perhaps by thirty thousand men was a sight worth seeing. There was firmness in the faces of those thousands of people who listened to the speeches, yet without applause or any other effusive demonstration. The organisers deserve the warmest praise for having introduced into our meetings the ancient peacefulness, quiet, determination and orderliness in the place of modern fluster, excitement and disorderliness. The one develops just the qualities that make for *Satyagrah*, the other inevitably leads to violence. And the message of the great meeting and the very successful *hartal* is not violence but non-violence. I hope that the authorities will not misread the situation. They will not fail to understand the admirable spirit of the whole demonstration or the equally admirable spirit of the resolution—a resolution to which in my humble opinion it is impos-

sible for any honest lover of this country or the Empire to take exception. I hope too, that they will read the spirit of the movement in the manner in which it is developing. I hope that the exemplary patience, self-restraint and orderliness that are evolving in our midst will have their due weight with them and that they will inform the Imperial Government that whilst there is this admirable peace in the land there is also a grim determination behind it which will not take "no" for an answer. I hope that Government will not repeat the sin of last April and entertain any false hope of tyranny and unquenchable spirit that has come into being and that will suffer everything but humiliation, dishonour and defeat.

It is a matter of deep regret that so respected a body as the Liberal League should have hastily and in advance condemned the *hartal*. Surely a people so stricken with grief and with disappointment probably staring them in the face must have an outlet for orderly manifestation. It was because not very long ago we were afraid to speak or write what we thought that our sentiments burrowed under and became foul with stench because of the absence of the fierce sun and the open air of public opinion playing upon them. Hence we had a secret revolutionary movement. Today, thank God, we seem to have outlived the evil day. We dare to think, speak and write openly, without fear, but under restraint that openness imposes upon mankind. I appeal to the members of the Liberal League and those who think with them to recognise this plain fact and to appreciate the superiority of boldness over timid caution. If they desire to harness all the innumerable forces that

are coming daily into being for the uplift of the nation, if they wish to become privileged participators in the throes of the new birth, let them not ignore the signs of the time, let them not reject the advances of the younger generation, let them not chill their ardent hopes and aspirations, but let them head this growing party of young, enthusiastic, self-sacrificing, dare-devil men. Sympathise with them, respond to the heart's throb, regulate it, for they are amenable to reason or an appeal to their high-souledness—and you have a disciplined party, obedient to the call of the country. But if they feel neglected, if they feel that the older heads will not patiently listen to their wants, will not give them a helping hand, they may despair and despair may lead to desperation resulting in a catastrophic destruction. I can recall no time so magnificently suitable for leading India to the method of *Satyagrah*—not necessarily civil disobedience, but truth and non-violence—in which there is no defeat and in which, if there is any error, it hurts but those who err.

CONTEMPT OF COURT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 24, 1920.)

The long expected hearing of the case against the editor and the publisher of *Young India* in connection with the publication of a letter of the District Judge of Ahmedabad regarding Satyagraha Lawyers and my comments thereon has been heard and judgment has been pronounced. But the editor and the publisher have

been severely reprimanded. But the Court did not see its way to pass any sentence upon either of us. If I dwell upon the judgment it is only because I am anxious as a Satyagrahi to draw a moral from it. I wish to assure those friends who out of pure friendliness advised us to tender the required apology, that I refused to accept their advice not out of obstinacy but because there was a great principle at stake. I had to conserve a journalist's independence and yet respect the law. My own reading of the law was that there was no contempt committed by me. But my defence rested more upon the fact that I could not offer an apology if I was not prepared not to repeat the offence on a similar occasion. Because I hold that an apology tendered to a Court to be true has to be as sincere as a private apology. At the same time I owed a duty to the Court. It was no light thing for me to accept the advice of the Chief Justice especially when the Chief Justice was so very considerate in the correspondence with me. I was on the horns of a dilemma. I therefore decided not to offer any defence but simply to make a statement frankly and fully defining my position, leaving it to the Court to pass any sentence it thought fit in the event of an adverse decision. In order to show that I meant no disrespect of the Court and that I did not desire to advertise the case I took extraordinary precautions to prevent publicity and I venture to think that I succeeded eminently in convincing the Court that behind my disobedience—if it was disobedience, there was no defiance but perfect resignation, there was no anger or ill-will but perfect restraint and respect; that if I did not apologise, I did not, because an insincere

apology would have been contrary to my conscience. I hold that it was about as perfect an instance of civil disobedience as it ever has been my privilege to offer. And I feel that the Court reciprocated in a most handsome manner and recognised the spirit of civility that lay behind my so-called disobedience. The luminous judgment of Justice Marten lays down the law, and decides against me. But I feel thankful that it does not question the propriety of my action. Justice Hayward's judgment recognises it as an instance of passive, i. e., civil resistance and practically makes it the reason for not awarding any sentence. Here then we have an almost complete vindication of civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well understood principle, must not be capricious and above all must have no ill-will or hatred behind it. I submit that the disobedience offered by Mr. Desai and myself contained all these ingredients.

THE SATYAGRAHA WEEK.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(31st March, 1920)

(First and foremost in the programme for the holy National Week I put fasting and prayer. I have said enough to emphasise the necessity of both these for the unfoldment of our national life. I speak of these from personal experience. But writing to a friend on this very matter of prayer, I came across a beautiful thing from Tennyson which I present to the readers of *Young India*.

if perchance I might convert them to a definite belief in the efficacy of prayer. Here is the gem :

“More things are wrought by prayer
 “ Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
 “ Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
 “ For what are men better than sheep or goats
 “ That nourish a blind life within the brain,
 “ If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
 “ Both for themselves and those who call them friend ?
 “ For so the whole round earth is every way
 “ Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.”)

Throughout my wanderings in India, I have had the privilege of mixing with men of all creeds, of mixing with thousands of women, hundreds upon hundreds of students. I have discussed with them national problems with a passion which I am unable to describe. I have found that we have not yet reached a conscious recognition of our national state. We have not had the discipline necessary for a realisation of that state and I venture to say that there is nothing so powerful as fasting and prayer that would give us the requisite discipline, spirit of self-sacrifice, humility and resoluteness of will without which there can be no real progress. I hope therefore that millions throughout India will open the Satyagraha Week with sincere fasting and prayer.

I do not wish, during this week, to emphasise the civil resistance part of Satyagraha. I would like us to contemplate truth and non-violence, and to appreciate their invincibility. Indeed, if all of us regulated our lives by this eternal law of *Satya* and *Ahimsa*, there will be no occasion for civil or other resistance. Civil resistance

comes into play when only a small body of men endeavour to follow truth in the face of opposition. It is difficult to know what is truth, when to defend it to the point of civil resistance, and how to avoid error in the shape of violence in one's pursuit after truth. There may well be difference of opinion as to the advisability of preaching civil resistance as a creed during a week devoted to national uplift, in which one seeks the co-operation of all without distinction of party, class or creed.

Beyond the prayer and fasting on the 6th and the 13th we have the collection for the Jallianwala Bagh Memorial. I trust that complete organisation would be set up in every province, in every district, and every town or village.

The third part of the activity is represented by three meetings during the week all over India at the stated times, whereat I have suggested the passing of certain resolutions, viz. on the Rowlatt Act which gave rise to the Satyagraha movement, the Khilafat question which by Hindu association cements Hindu-Muslim unity and what may be called the Jallianwala Bagh resolution to be passed on the 13th April calling upon the Government to take such measures as may be necessary to prevent a repetition of the tragedies that were witnessed during Martial Law regime and which were opened even before the inauguration of Martial Law by the unlawful massacre of the 13th. I suggest the following resolutions for acceptance :—

FOR THE 6TH APRIL.

1. This meeting of the citizens of.....hereby places on record its emphatic opinion that there will be

no peace in the land until the Rowlatt Act is repealed and therefore appeals to the Government of India to introduce at the earliest opportunity a bill repealing that act.

FOR THE 9TH APRIL.

2. This meeting of Hindus, Mahomedans and others, the inhabitants of.....trusts that the Khilafat question will be solved consistantly with the just demands of the Mussalmans of India and with the solemn pledges of his Majesty's ministers and this meeting records its opinion that in the event of adverse decision being arrived at, it will be the duty of every Indian to withdraw co-operation from the Government until the pledges are fulfilled and Mussalman sentiment conciliated.

FOR THE 13TH APRIL.

3. This meeting of the inhabitants of.....is of opinion that whilst mob excesses at Amritsar although committed after grave provocation, were worthy of condemnation, the deliberate and calculated massacre, without warning, by General Dyer, of innocent, unarmed and otherwise defenceless men at Jallianwala Bagh was an unexampled act of barbarity and hopes that the Government of India and the Imperial Government will take such steps as will render impossible a repetition of such barbarity and other similar barbarities committed by responsible officers in the Punjab during the period of Martial Law administration and hopes that recommendations made by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress will be carried out in their entirety.

PURE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

(June 7, 1920.)

All the readers of *Young India* may not know that Ahmedabad came under a heavy fine for misdeeds of the April of last year. The fine was collected from the residents of Ahmedabad but some were exempted at the discretion of the collector. Among those who were called upon to pay the fines were income-tax payers. They had to pay a third of the tax paid by them. Mr. V. J. Patel, a noted barrister, and Dr. Kanuga, a leading medical practitioner, were among those who were unable to pay. They had admittedly helped the authorities to quell the disturbance. No doubt they were Satyagrahis but they had endeavoured to still the mob fury even at some risk to their own persons. But the authorities would not exempt them. It was a difficult thing for them to use discretion in individual cases. It was equally difficult for these two gentlemen to pay any fine when they were not to blame at all. They did not wish to embarrass the authorities and yet they were anxious to preserve their self-respect. They carried on no agitation but simply notified their inability to pay the fines in the circumstances set fourth above. Therefore an attachment was issued. Dr. Kanuga is a very busy practitioner and his box is always full. The watchful attaching official attached his cash box and extracted enough money to discharge the writ of execution. A lawyer's business cannot be conducted on those lines. Mr. Patel sported no cash box. A sofa of his sitting-room was therefore attached and advertised for sale and duly sold. Both these Satyagrahis thus completely saved their consciences.

Wiseacres may laugh at the folly of allowing writs of attachment and paying for the collection of fines. Multiply such instances and imagine the consequence to the authorities of executing thousands of writs. Writs are possible when they are confined to a few recalcitrants. They are troublesome when they have to be executed against many high-souled persons who have done no wrong and who refuse payment to vindicate a principle. They may not attract much notice when isolated individuals resort to this method of protest. But clean examples have a curious method of multiplying themselves. They bear publicity and the sufferers instead of incurring odium receive congratulations. Men like Thoreau brought about the abolition of slavery by their personal examples. Says Thoreau, "I know this well, that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could name,—if ten *honest* men only—aye, if *one* honest man, in this state of Massachusetts *ceasing to hold slaves* were actually to withdraw from this co-partnership and be locked up in the country gaol therefor, it would be the abolition of slavery in America. For it matters not how small the beginning may seem to be, what is once well done is done for ever." Again he says, "I have contemplated the imprisonment of the offender rather than seizure of his goods—though both will serve the same purpose, because they who assert the purest right and consequently are most dangerous to a corrupt State, commonly have not spent much time in accumulating property." We therefore congratulate Mr. Patel and Dr. Kanuga on the excellent example set by them in an excellent spirit and in an excellent cause.

DURGADAS ADWANI

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December, 3, 1919)

Durgadas Adwani is one of the best workers I have had the privilege of meeting. I came to know him through correspondence, immediately on my arrival in India in 1915. The occasion that gave rise to the correspondence showed the true man in Durgadas. He has been a consistent, conscientious and zealous worker in Sind for many years. He has now gone to gaol for one year with hard labour. I have been asked to give my opinion on the judgment of the appellate Court. In my humble opinion the judgment is unsound. The Court has erred in holding that "New Call" was a seditious leaflet and it has strained the analysis of evidence to record a finding against Durgadas. But in giving this opinion, I admit I may be biased in favour of Durgadas. I do not believe him to be capable of telling an untruth in order to avoid imprisonment. The evidence *may* bear the meaning placed upon it by the appellate Court.

But as a friend and as a Satyagrahi, I must decline to condole with Durgadas or his family upon his incarceration. Durgadas has after great deliberation taken the Satyagraha pledge. And I seize the opportunity offered by this case of placing before the reader my views about such cases. We spend too much money in litigation and in appeals. We have an excessive dread of prisons. I have not a shadow of doubt that society will be much cleaner and healthier if there was less resort to law courts than

there is. The rush after the best counsel is undignified. It is unapadonable when it is indulged in at public expense. But it is sinful when a Satyagrahi spends money after the best legal talent or after appeals. I was therefore pained when I heard of appeals in the "New Call" convictions. If one has committed an offence he must plead guilty and suffer the penalty. If he has not and is still found guilty, imprisonment for him is no disagree. And if he is a Satyagrahi he has 'no business' to fear the hardships of gaol life.

We in India whilst we are living in an atmosphere surcharged with suspicion and distrust and in the midst of a secret police department unrivalled, perhaps in the world, for its duplicity and unscrupulousness, must use ourselves to the gaol life if we want to mend that department and remove distrust and suspicion.

The best and quickest way to deliverance from the distrust and secret police department is to rid the country of false fear and all violence. But till that far off day arrives, the handful of Satyagrahis must be prepared to treat the prison as their second home.

I hope therefore that the friends of Durgadas will not advise him or his wife to petition for mercy nor add to the wife's unhappiness by commiserating with her. On the contrary it is our duty to ask her to steel her heart and feel glad that her husband is in goal for no fault of his own. The truest service that we can render to Durgadas would be to offer Mrs. Durgadas such assistance, pecuniary or otherwise, as she may need. I understand that the "New Call" cases have cost nearly Rs. 15,000. The money could certainly have been utilised to better

purpose. It is not right to beggar ourselves by fighting against odds. It is hardly manful to be over-anxious about the result of political trials that involve no disgrace.

Here in the Punjab I find mothers with stricken hearts coming and shedding tears over the imprisonment of their sons whom they regard as innocent. I know I am helpless. But it is so difficult to comfort them. To give them false hope would be a sin. To ask them patiently to endure what cannot be cured brings no comfort. I am therefore endeavouring to perform the uphill task of asking them to be Satyagrahis enough to realise that we shall only perpetuate political conviction so long as we fret and foam and worry over the imprisonment of our dear ones. Needless to say I am not here thinking of imprisonments for acts of actual incendiarism or murder.

THE SATYAGRAHI LAWYERS

(October 22, 1919.)

The judgment of the High Court in the case of the Satyagrahi Lawyers is, to say the least, highly unsatisfactory. It has shirked the issue. The logical outcome of the judgment should have been punishment and not a postponement of it. The lawyers in question had shown no repentance. So far as the public know, they will be ready to offer civil disobedience should the occasion arise. The issue having been raised, the lawyers did not ask for mercy but a clear decision. As it is they do not know where they are.

The learned judges have laid down principles of legal conduct which in our humble opinion are open to question. For instance what is the meaning of "those who live by the law must keep the law." If it means that no lawyer may ever commit a civil breach without incurring the displeasure of the Court, it means utter stagnation. Lawyers are the persons most able to appreciate the dangers of bad legislation and it must be with them a sacred duty by committing civil breach to prevent a criminal breach. Lawyers should be guardians of law and liberty and as such are interested in keeping the statute book of the country 'pure and undefiled.' But the judges of the Bombay High Court have presented to them a mercenary view of their profession and have even confounded the functions of judges and lawyers. The only escape from the intolerable situation created by the judgment is for the respondents to have the case restored to the board, reargued and to ask for a final decision. Fortunately the judges have left that course open to the Satyagrahi lawyers.

PART II

The Punjab Wrongs

THE SCOPE OF THE HUNTER COMMITTEE

(December 17, 1919.)

We have no doubt that the stereotyped reply that the Bombay Government have given to the Hon. Rao Saheb Harilal Desai's questions* regarding disturbances in Ahmedabad and Kaira—printed in another column will shock the public by reason of its calculated evasiveness. A careful study of the questions will make it clear that the Government have taken an unfair advantage of the Hon. Rao Saheb Desai's overinquisitiveness or tactical error, and purposely kept the public in the dark about certain matters of very great importance. We are of opinion that some of the questions can be easily divided into those of facts and those of disputable matters as the supposed or real causes of the disturbances and propriety or otherwise of the measures taken to cope with them. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Rao Saheb Desai in the commendable attempt to elicit all important information, neglected this important consideration, and grouped together those questions *en masse*, and thereby gave Government an opportunity—however slight—of evading them.

* Not included in this collection.

Space does not allow us to go through every one of the questions. But a few typical instances may be taken. There is for example the question asking for the date and time when martial law was declared in Ahmedabad and when it ended. There is surely no reason why Government should not have been prepared to furnish this information. It is a question of fact which has nothing to do with the propriety or otherwise of the introduction of Martial Law. There is the question asking for information showing the name, parentage, age, caste, residence and profession of persons who were shot by the military in Ahmedabad. So far as these facts are concerned the Government had no reason to withhold information. It will be remembered that the Hon. Pandit Malaviyaji asked a similar question at the September session of the Imperial Legislative Council. The text of it was: "Whether the Government will be pleased to state the number of persons who were killed or died of wounds or were wounded, but recovered, during the recent disturbances in the Punjab giving the names, parentage, and other particulars specifying the place where such person was killed or wounded?" The reply was: "The numbers so far ascertained were: Lahore 14, Amritsar 301, Gujranwala 17, Gujrat 2, Total 334. Information as to names etc. not available." We cannot conceive why the Government could not furnish similar information as regards disturbances in Ahmedabad. We will frankly say that the inquiry in the second part of the same question (XXII) regarding "the date etc. where the felonious act for which in each case the shooting done was *absolutely necessary*," trenches on the scope of the in-

quiry of the Hunter Committee. Similarly question No. XII, part of question No. XIII and XXIII, question No. XXII (c) do appear to us to fall within the subject matter of the Committee of Inquiry. But that only suggests that the Government should have split up the questions and given information as regards facts and kept silent as regards matters coming within the scope of the Committee's inquiry.

We have purposely kept apart, for separate consideration, the important questions VI, XI, XVI relating to matters arising out of an order under Section 25 (a) of the District Police Act. These are all questions arising entirely out of the *administration* of the penal measure and Government were bound to furnish information as regards facts which reveal the proper or improper character of the administration. It will be noticed that the Hon. Rao Sahab Harilal has not questioned the propriety of the penal measure, which may be regarded as the subject-matter of the inquiry. He has, we repeat, questioned the justice of the administration of the measure. The evasiveness of the Government has not even the barest justification here. Its absurdity will be apparent from a consideration whether the Committee is going to inquire into, for instance, the year in which a burnt or damaged Government building was constructed, or the amount spent on its construction or why certain persons were exempted from the penalty, or whether those "who apply for exemption are the only persons who in fact are considered to be entitled to exemption." These are clearly questions which, in our opinion, can best be answered, and can only be answered, by the government.

We do not know whether the Hunter Committee has

been advised to widen the scope of its inquiry in the terms of the Government's reply or whether its inquiry has from the first included within its scope the question evaded by the Government. We hope either Secretary of the Hunter Committee or the Government will enlighten the public by publishing a Press Communique.

DISSEMBLANCE OR NEGLIGENCE

(January, 7, 1920)

Mr. Montagu is reported by Reuter to have made the statement, in reply to Mr. Swan that "the Congress demanded the *unconditional release* of the persons on *security* during the inquiry which was boycotted because their demand had not been granted." We do not know who is really responsible for the mutually contradictory phrases in the statement, Mr. Montagu or Reuter. But surely Reuter cannot be responsible for the suppression of the real truth in the matter, viz. the Sub-Committee's demand for the release, during inquiry, of the principal leaders, as prisoners *in custody*. There can be no doubt that Mr. Montagu was in possession of the real facts when he replied to Mr. Swan. For as early as *November 17*, the following cablegram was sent to him by the Hon. Pandit Malaviya :—"Have just read your reply to Colonel Wedgwood saying the Hunter Committee could recommend that the sentences be reviewed entirely. If the Hunter Committee is to make any such recommendation, the presence in the Committee room of the principal

prisoners is absolutely necessary, but the Local Government *declined to let the prisoners attend, even in custody*. The officials whose acts are under review by Hunter Committee freely attend its proceedings and instruct Government counsel " etc. Synchronously with this a long cablegram was sent to Sir Sankaran Nair in which the fact was expressly mentioned that " the Congress Sub-Committee was willing to be content with this little concession " viz. the release of *six prisoners on parole only for the day of their examination* " provided that the principal leaders were permitted to attend the Committee's *sittings under custody* on other days when witnesses regarding their respective localities were produced in order that they might help counsel to test and check official witnesses whilst under examination." This cablegram was also published in England soon after. Did Mr. Montagu then dissemble the facts? If he did not—and we hesitate to believe that he did—how is the puzzle to be solved? The solution is we think to be sought in the Hon. Pandit Malviyaji's cablegram to Mr. Montagu dated 13th November which stated that the " Sub Committee National Congress requested the temporary release, for the purpose of the enquiry, *on bail* of principal Punjab leaders now under going imprisonment for what may be termed political offences. Punjab Government have refused the request. My Committee has therefore been regretfully obliged to withdraw co-operation from Hunter's Committee " etc. It is very likely that Mr. Montagu was all the while thinking of this cable, that he did not care to read carefully the Hon. Pandit's later cablegram and that he still continues

to be under the impression that the Sub Committee's demand was for unconditional *release*. If this is the case it betrays clear negligence on Mr. Montagu's part. The result of the negligence is that the British public has been led, howsoever temporarily, to believe that the Congress Committee's demand was excessive and that the *impasse* occurred which, if Mr. Montagu had known the facts and interfered, could have been avoided.

BY WAY OF CONTRAST

(19th November 1919.)

The Rubicon has been crossed. The Government have found it impossible to accede to the request of the All-India Congress Sub-Committee "for the *temporary* release on *adequate security* of the principal Punjab leaders." Now this request was eminently moderate, as it could not have been otherwise proceeding as it did from the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji. It is too late in the day to expatiate on the paramount necessity for the release of the leaders. It should be as clear as daylight to all. It is a misfortune that Government's vision is too much blurred by considerations of prestige to see it. The Hon. Pandit Malaviyaji rightly cited the precedent of the Solomon Committee in his letter to Lord Hunter, for it is the duty of the Hunter Committee to see to it that for their enquiry to be real and not a farce, the fullest freedom should be given to the public to present their case.

It may not be out of place here to contrast the procedure adopted by this Committee with that of the

Solomon Committee. Messrs. Gandhi, Kallenbach and Polak were in Pretoria Jail when the Commission began its sittings in November 1913. Sir William Solomon, eminent jurist that he was, instinctively saw the steps that were necessary to be taken before his Commission proceeded on its enquiry. On the first day of the sittings he stated—no repeated requests had to be made to him to do so—that “it would be to the advantage of interested parties, and of assistance to the Commission if the former were represented by counsel.” He next stated that the Government of India if they desired to appear before the Commission might do so. And the last and the most important of his statements was that “with a view to enabling the inquiry to be as thorough as possible, the Commission had recommended to the Government that inasmuch as the strike of Indians in Natal was at an end, Messrs. Gandhi, Polak, Kallenbach and any other strike leaders at present in gaol should be immediately released.” Of these Mr. Gandhi had then still to serve a period of over ten months. But they were *immediately* and *unconditionally* released. It will be noticed that the request for the release of the leaders did not proceed from the community, the Commission acted on their own initiative, and that none of the released leaders were anxious that they should be released, as all of them declared on the day of their release that they preferred the peace of the prison. It will also be noticed that the leaders were in jail for admitted breaches of the law; while here it is the people who are pressing for the release of the leaders, who, the public unmistakably feel, have been most wrongly incarcerated. Whereas the leaders in South Africa had

to give no recognisances even for full freedom, Government here are unable to set the leaders free even "temporarily for the purpose of the inquiry", and on adequate security. No contrast could be more painfully complete.

Nothing could be more impolitic than the refusal of the preeminently moderate request of the Sub-Committee, and the Government will have none but themselves to thank, if they fail to justify themselves in the eyes of the world.

POLITICAL FREEMASONRY

BY M. K. GANDHI.

(June 9, 1920.)

(Freemasonry is a secret brotherhood which has more by its secret and iron rules than by its service to humanity obtained a hold upon some of the best minds. Similarly there seems to be some secret code of conduct governing the official class in India before which the flower of the great British nation fall prostrate and unconsciously become instruments of injustice which as private individuals they would be ashamed of perpetrating. In no other way is it possible for one to understand the majority report of the Hunter Committee, the despatch of the Government of India and the reply thereto of the Secretary of State for India.) In spite of the energetic protests of a section of the Press to the personnel of the Committee, it might be said that on the whole the public were prepared to trust it especially as it contained three Indian members who could fairly be claimed to be

independant. The first rude shock to this confidence was delivered by the refusal of Lord Hunter's committee to accept the very moderate and reasonable demand of the Congress Committee that the imprisoned Punjab leaders might be allowed to appear before it to instruct counsel. Any doubt that might have been left in the mind of any person has been dispelled by the report of the majority of that committee. The result has justified the attitude of the Congress Committee. The evidence collected by it shows what Lord Hunter's committee purposely denied itself.

The minority report stands out like an oasis in a desert. The Indian members deserve the congratulation of their countrymen for having dared to do their duty in the face of heavy odds. I wish that they had refused to associate themselves even in a modified manner with the condemnation of the civil disobedience form of Satyagrah. The defiant spirit of the Delhi mob on the 30th March can hardly be used for condemning a great spiritual movement which is admittedly and manifestly intended to restrain the violent tendencies of mobs and to replace criminal lawlessness by civil disobedience of authority, when it has forfeited all title to respect. On the 30th March civil disobedience had not even been started. Almost every great popular demonstration has been hitherto attended all the world over by a certain amount of lawlessness. The demonstration of 30th March and 6th April could have been held under any other agencies as under that of Satyagrah. I hold that without the advent of the spirit of civility and orderliness, the disobedience would have taken a much more violent form than it did

even at Delhi. It was only the wonderfully quick acceptance by the people, of the principle of Satyagrah that effectively checked the spread of violence throughout the length and breadth of India. And even to-day it is not the memory of the black barbarity of General Dyer that is keeping the undoubted restlessness among the people from breaking forth into violence. They hold that Satyagrah has gained on the people—it may be even against their will is curbing the forces of disorder and violence. But I must not detain the reader on a defence of Satyagrah against unjust attacks. If it has gained a foothold in India, it will survive much fiercer attacks than the one made by the majority of the Hunter Committee and somewhat supported by the minority. Had the majority report been defective only in this direction and correct in every other, there would have been nothing but praise for it. After all Satyagrah is a new experiment in political field. And a hasty attributing to it of any popular disorder would have been pardonable.

The universally pronounced adverse judgment upon the report and the despatches rests upon far more painful relations. Look at the manifestly laboured defence of every official act of inhumanity except where condemnation could not be avoided through the impudent admissions made by the actors themselves; look at the special pleading introduced to defend General Dyer even against himself; look at the vain glorification of Sir Michael O'Dwyer although it was his spirit that actuated every act of criminality on the part of the subordinate; look at the deliberate refusal to examine his wild career before the events of April. His acts were an

open book of which the committee ought to have taken judicial notice. Instead of accepting everything that the officials had to say, the Committee's obvious duty was to tax itself to find out the real cause of the disorders. It ought to have gone out of its way to search out the inwardness of the events. Instead of patiently going behind the hard crust of official documents, the Committee allowed itself to be guided with criminal laziness by mere official evidence. The report and the despatches, in my humble opinion, constitute an attempt to condone official lawlessness. The cautious and half-hearted condemnation pronounced upon General Dyer's massacre and the notorious crawling order only deepens the disappointment of the reader as he goes through page after page of thinly disguised official whitewash. I need, however, scarcely attempt any elaborate examination of the report the despatches which have been so justly censured by the whole national press whether of the moderate or the extremist hue. The point to consider is how to break down this secret—be the secrecy ever so unconscious—conspiracy to uphold official iniquity. A scandal of this magnitude cannot be tolerated by the nation, if it is to preserve its self-respect and become a free partner in the Empire. The All India Congress Committee has resolved upon convening a special session of the Congress for the purpose of considering, among other things, the situation arising from the report. In my opinion the time has arrived when we must cease to rely upon mere petitions to Parliament for effective action. Petitions will have value, when the nation has behind it the power to enforce its will. What power then have

we ? When we are firmly of opinion that grave wrong has been done us and when after an appeal to the highest authority we fail to secure redress, there must be some power available to us for undoing the wrong. It is true that in the vast majority of cases, it is the duty of a subject to submit to wrongs on failure of the usual procedure, so long as they do not effect his vital being. But every nation and every individual has the right, and it is their duty, to rise against an intolerable wrong. I do not believe in armed risings. They are a remedy worse than the disease sought to be cured. They are a token of the spirit of revenge and impatience and anger. The method of violence cannot do good in the long run. Witness the effect of the armed rising of the allied powers against Germany. Have they not become even like the Germans, as the later have been depicted to us by them ?

We have a better method. Unlike that of violence it certainly involves the exercise of restraint and patience ; but it requires also resoluteness of will. This method is to refuse to be party to the wrong. No tyrant has ever yet succeeded in his purpose without carrying the victim with him, it may be, as it often is by force. Most people choose rather to yield to the will of the tyrant than to suffer for the consequence of resistance. Hence does terrorism form part of the stock-in-trade of the tyrant. But we have instances in history where terrorism has failed to impose the terrorist's will upon his victim. India has choice before her now. If then the acts of the Punjab Government be an insufferable wrong, if the report of Lord Hunter's committee and the two despatches be a greater wrong by reason of their grievous condona-

tion of these acts, it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this Official violence. Appeal the Parliament by all means if necessary, but if the Parliament fails us and if we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing co-operation from it.

THE PUNJAB NON-OFFICIAL REPORT

(31st March, 1920.)

The much expected report is published. The Commissioners may congratulate themselves on the methodical manner in which they have approached their work and the moderation with which they have handled their difficult task. The status of the Commissioners must give added weight to a report which is otherwise capable of standing on its merits. The Commissioners have not travelled beyond the evidence they had in their possessions. The reader is, therefore, if he is so minded, able to test the conclusions for himself. The recommendations are neither wild nor weak. The Commissioners boldly ask for the recall of the Viceroy, and the dismissal from service of Sir Michæl O'Dwyer, General Dyer and other officers. These are the two recommendations against which there may be some opposition. But the Commissioners have given clear and unimpeachable reasons for each recommendation. And if the veracity of the facts set forth by them is not challenged, their recommendations are unchallengeable.

It is not without much pain that we find ourselves in agreement with the recommendations for the Viceroy's

recall. We believe His Excellency to be a cultured English gentleman, meaning well by India and anxious to do the right thing. But these are not the sole qualifications for the high Viceregal office. Lord Chelmsford has undoubtedly shown a lack of imagination. He has applied to his Indian office the traditions of a colonial constitutional Governor who has invariably to be guided by the advice of his ministers, is politically precluded from taking the initiative and affects colonial policies, if he affects them at all, not in virtue of office but through subtle influence and social intercourse. A Governor in the self-governing colonies acts by making gentle suggestions, never pressing them on his ministers, and tries to move public opinion, not by exercise of authority but by making indirect friends at social and semi-political functions. The very qualities therefore that enable a Colonial Governor to make a success of himself disqualify Lord Chelmsford for the Viceregal office. The Viceroy of India has immense powers, he is an autocrat, he dominates the Executive Council. A mere suggestion from him is like a legal sanction. He initiates and gives effect to policies. He supervises, with the very tangible right of intervention, the administration of the provinces. He has, therefore, to be a strong ruler, with great imagination, with popular sympathies which he is never afraid to show. With all the qualities of the heart Lord Chelmsford has shown himself to be weak at critical junctures. Instead of leading his colleagues he has allowed himself to be ruled by them. He has allowed his provincial administrators to do as they have liked. The result was a variety of

policies—level-headedness or conciliation in Bombay even under provocation; repression, presecution and intolerance without provocation in the Punjab. Such a contrast should be impossible under a Central Government with a chief at the centre who knows his mind and who knows how to impose his will on his subordinates. Lord Chelmsford has signally failed and so we believe that the Commissioners would have failed in their duty if they had hesitated to advise with the facts before them, the recall of His Excellency the Viceroy.

With reference to the findings too, the Commissioners have ‘if anything’ erred on the side of moderation. But perhaps it would be better for the public to discuss the findings after the publication of the report of the official Committee. So far as the evidence collected by the non-official Commissioners goes, we feel that no other findings were possible. Indeed going through the evidence we can see a studious attempt to refrain from stating conclusions which could not be absolute supported by overwhelming array of facts.

THE PUNJAB SENTENCES

By M.K. GANDHI

(April 7, 1921.)

The commissioners appointed by the Congress Punjab Sub-committee have in their report accused His Excellency the Viceroy of criminal want of imagination. His Excellency's refusal to commute two death sentences out of five is a fine illustration of the accusation. The rejec-

tion of the appeal by the Privy Council no more proves the guilt of the condemned than their innocence could have been proved by quashing the proceedings before the Martial Law Tribunal. Moreover, these cases clearly come under the Royal Proclamation in accordance with its interpretation by the Punjab Government. The murders in Amritsar were not due to any private quarrel between the murderers and their victims. The offence grave though it was, was purely political and committed under excitement. More than full reparation has been taken for the murders and arson. In the circumstances common sense dictates reduction of the death sentences. The popular belief favours the view that the condemned men are innocent and have not had a fair trial. The execution has been so long delayed that hanging at this stage would give a rude shock to Indian society. Any Viceroy with imagination would have at once announced commutation of the death sentences—not so Lord Chelmsford. In his estimation, evidently, the demands of justice will not be satisfied if at least some of the condemned men are not hanged. Public feeling with him counts for nothing. We shall still hope that either the Viceroy or Mr. Montagu will commute the death sentences.

But if the Government will grievously err, if they carry out the sentences, the people will equally err if they give way to anger or grief over the hanging if it has unfortunately to take place. Before we become a nation possessing an effective voice in the councils of nations, we must be prepared to contemplate with equanimity, not a thousand murders of innocent men and women but many

HOW THE VICEROY DISCHARGES HIS TRUST 85

thousands before we attain a status in the world that shall not be surpassed by any nation. We hope therefore that all concerned will take rather than lose heart and treat hanging as an ordinary affair of life.

[Since the above was in type, we have received the cruel news. At last H. E. the Viceroy has mercilessly given the rude shock to Indian society. It is now for the latter to take heart inspite of the unkindest cut.—Ed. Y. I.]

HOW THE VICEROY DISCHARGES HIS TRUST

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October, 6, 1920.)

The reader will find reproduced elsewhere the Viceroy's cablegram to Mr. Montagu * in refutation of

* Dear Sir, Your Secretary's letter of 24th August, enclosing at your direction the paraphrase of the Government of India's telegram, has only just reached me on my return from the country, or I should have answered it earlier.

I note that it has also been communicated to the Press, but apparently without being accompanied by the previous correspondence between us, which is essential to a proper understanding of the whole matter.

I can hardly believe that the Government of India's telegram is seriously put forward as a refutation of charges of the gravest kind, based on the statements of witnesses whose evidence has been tested by cross-examination, and is published on the authority of a Committee consisting of distinguished and widely respected men, who are all members of the English Bar, one of whom has filled a high judicial office, and two of whom hold leading positions as practising lawyers in their respective Provinces; while the integrity of our friend Mr. Gandhi, and his scrupulous care in such matters are as well-known to you as to me.

If that is so, are we asked to accept a bare denial put forward by the Deputy Commissioner—an interested party—covered and confused by

Shrimathi Sarojini Naidu's allegation regarding the ill-treatment of woman in the Punjab during the Martial Law period, as also Shrimati Sarojini's spirited reply. It seems that every responsible statement made by His Excellency only strengthens the opinion of the public that he is totally unfit for the great trust which has been reposed in him. I do

entirely irrelevant allegations, made obviously with the hops of discrediting the unfortunate, victims of conduct, the revolting brutality of which cannot be qualified by the character of those subjected to it.

I am ashamed to think that a British official should suppose that such an atrocious charge could be lightly disposed of by such a callous and contemptible method as the suggestion that the people concerned are too degraded to have any claim on human credulity.

May I remind you that specific charges have been made of gross outrage on several women? I refer you to statement 147 of the Congress Committee's evidence. There is nothing in the Government of India's telegram which disposes of these charges.

The remark that "The women stayed in a public lane adjoining the Kotwali, or police-station, where no public officer would dare to treat them indecently" is preposterous in view of the terrorized condition of the populace throughout the period of martial law, and the acknowledged facts recording every kind of outrage inflicted on individuals of all classes in public.

It is, moreover, a monstrous misrepresentation to say that "It is common knowledge in India that low class women embroider their complaints in this fashion." I am proud to believe that the most fallen Indian woman would recoil from the humiliation of being forced, except, under dire necessity, to relate the story of such an odious outrage,

The further suggestion that such statements had been made from motives of revenge is not only unworthy and incredible, but is actually discredited by the Government of India's admission that no complaints were made at the time, and the fact that these charges only came to light when investigators whom they had no cause to fear were at work some months later.

I cannot conceive what relevancy the final paragraph of the Government of India's telegram has to these charges, but it is interesting to

not wish to add one word to what Shrimati Sarojini has said in condemnation of the Viceroy's attitude; but I would draw the reader's attention to the ignoring of some very material allegations that were made by the Shrimati. Even assuming the propriety of rejecting the evidence of prostitutes because they are engaged in the unfortunate traffic, what has His Excellency to say

learn that a judicial tribunal was in receipt of confidential reports concerning the person whom it tried

However satisfactory, so futile and dishonest an attempt to deal with grave charges might seem to General Dyer's friends and admirers inside and out of Parliament, I prefer to cherish the belief that the public in this country will not be so easily convinced, and it is certain that Indians who are chiefly interested in this question could not possibly accept unsupported denials either by officials or the Government of India, whose record in regard to the sufferings of the people of the Punjab has deprived it of all title to their confidence in matters of this kind.

As for me, I shall be prepared to disbelieve these charges only when they have been conclusively disproved by a proper judicial inquiry. Am I to infer that you do not propose to direct the Government of India to hold such an inquiry? I fully understood that the term 'special inquiry' in your letter of 10th July implied something more than a mere reference to the Deputy Commissioner.

May I also draw your attention to the other charges, equally grave, made against a British Officer by a very large number of women, and set out in detail in my letter to you of the 12th July? The Government of India's telegram does not deal with these at all, and I should be glad to learn what steps have been taken to ensure a thorough impartial investigation.

Yours faithfully,

(Sd.) Sarojini Naidu.

COPY.

The Viceroy's Cablegram. Disturbances in the Punjab and Congress Report. No complaints of ill-treatment made by the women in question. It is now reported by Deputy Commissioner that Mussammat Balochan and other women mentioned are all prostitutes of low class and belong to

regarding the evidence of the many women of Manianwalla against whom, in so far as I am aware, not a word of reproach has been whispered. I give below in full the statement of Guredevi, the widow of Mangal Jat. That statement was corroborated by several other women. This is the statement.

“One day, during the Martial Law period, Mr.

wandering criminal tribes of Safadahs and Pernas, who have settled in Amritsar city for purpose of prostitution. Convictions under Criminal Tribes Act against many members of tribe.

On information received, police raided house of Mussamat Rani and arrested Mirasis and Pernas mentioned below, who were in the act of dividing property looted from the National Bank. Large amount of bank property was recovered, and all the men present arrested. House was guarded by many Perni prostitutes. Of the men arrested four were convicted and sentenced to death in National Bank murder case, sentence being subsequently commuted to transportation for life. Five other convicted and sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for having possession of stolen property of bank, but they were released in December last. Balochan and the other Pernis who were guarding the house were taken to Kotwali, but in the evening they were allowed to go home on the understanding that they would appear next day, when it was decided that women should not be prosecuted. On both these days the women stayed in a public lane adjoining Kotwali, where no public officers could dare treat them indecently as alleged. It is common knowledge in India that low-class women embroider their complaints in this fashion. Deputy Commissioner says that charges are groundless and absolutely false, and only made out of revenge against those officers who gave evidence against them before martial law tribunals and took leading part in arrests and recovery of stolen property.

Two Perna men, when they were despatched to Lahore for trial before tribunal, made a great deal of fuss at the railway station and asked their relatives by way of revenge to lodge a complaint that two constables had taken a bribe. They added that they would personally deal with the constables if they themselves were released. Tribunal which tried National Bank murder case are said to have perused two confidential reports submitted in regard to this.

Bosworth Smith gathered together all the males of over 8 years at the Decca Dalla Bungalow, which is some miles from our village, in connection with the investigations that were going on. Whilst the men were at the Bungalow, he rode to our village, taking back with him all the women who met him on the way carrying food for their men at the Bungalow. Reaching the village, he went around the lanes and ordered all women to come out of their houses, himself forcing them out with sticks. He made us all stand near the village Daira. The women folded their hands before him. He beat some with his stick and spat at them and used the foulest and most unmentionable language. He hit me twice and spat in my face. He forcibly uncovered the faces of all the women, brushing aside the veils with his own stick.

He repeatedly called us she—asses, bitches, flies and swines and said: "You were in the same beds with your husbands; why did you not prevent them from going out to do mischief? Now your skirts will be looked into by the Police Constables." He gave me a kick also and ordered us to undergo the torture of holding our ears by passing our arms round the legs, whilst being bent double.)

This treatment was meted out to us in the absence of our men who were away at the Bungalow."

If the facts set forth are true can anything be more brutal or more loathsome? And yet the perpetrator of the crime will probably receive a pension from the Government treasury. The curious reader will find in the evidence collected ample material in proof of the depravity of the officer concerned. The evidence was first

collected by Mr. Andrews. Mr. Labhsingh M.A. Bar-at-law was especially deputed to go to Manianwalla to see the ladies concerned. He held a kind of public enquiry which any body was free to attend.

Mr. Montagu had his attention drawn to these statements when he hastily rebuked Shrimati Sarojini for her so-called recklessness of speech. And it was due to this that Mr. Montagu pompously ordered an inquiry. The Viceroy seems quietly to have ignored the instructions issued to him, and has held no inquiry. He has laid down a new canon of evidence, hitherto unknown, and the law upon it that the evidence of prostitutes is not to be trusted. In other words, the legitimate corollary to be drawn from the viceregal pronouncement is that prostitutes may not get justice done to them, unless their complaint is supported by other evidence. Any way Mr. Montagu has evidently accepted the Viceroy's explanation, and has thus strengthened the cause of non-co-operation. Can India for one moment associate herself with a Government that condones offences of a most barbarous nature committed against her own folk by its officers?

IT WAS A FRONTIER PROVINCE

(December 10, 1919.)

Mr. Kitchin, Commissioner, Lahore, being examined before the Hunter Committee was asked why it was in the Punjab alone that there were disturbances, while the other parts of India where *hartal* was observed there were none. He replied 'because it was a frontier pro-

vince.' In getting him further to explain his reply Sahebjada Sultan Ahmed involved him in a maze from which he could not extricate himself. This is the chain of questions and answers :—

Q. You said in answer to a question that the disturbances took place in the Punjab because it was a frontier province. I want to know the reason.

A. The troops were there.

Q. Because there were a large number of troops stationed in the province there were disturbances. I should have thought it would have a contrary effect.

A. Yes, it should have, but the military value of the Punjab is so much greater than other parts.

Q. I grant that. What I do not understand is that the Punjab is a frontier province and therefore there should be disturbances here and not in other provinces.

A. It should be said that political agitation in those days was much bitter in the Punjab than elsewhere.

Q. It was not because that it was frontier province but because of the agitation.

A. I don't pretend to explain the whole thing.

Q. You cannot explain it.

A. I cannot explain it.

We cannot blame Mr. Kitchen. He gave all the explanations, and solutions of the great question of questions—for that is the principal question the Hunter Committee is labouring to solve—and left Sahebjada Sultan Ahmed to read them between the lines and draw his own conclusion. Being one of the officers himself he could not have made a more direct confession. We believe when Mr. Kitchen first said, 'because it was a frontier pro-

vince,' he probably intended the Commissioners to understand that it was a province where there is generally the rule of fear rather than of love, of force rather than of persuasion or conciliation. The second reply viz. 'because there were troops' is a further explanation of the first that the officers could not think of conciliation, they always held the military before the people and provoked them. The third reply gives not so much the cause of the disturbances as the occasion thereof viz. bitter political agitation. But the fact is again that the province was a 'frontier province' in the sense we have given above, and it was therefore that the little political agitation in the province could not be tolerated, and was thought bitter enough to prove a sufficiency for the rule of force.

Thus it should not be taken that Mr. Kitchin failed to explain the great question of questions. He gave a frank and a comprehensive reply, and when he was puzzled, when faced with the seeming inconsistency of his different elucidations of the same reply, he said he could not explain.

BRAVE LALA LABHSINGH

(December 10, 1919.)

Lala Labhsingh, M. A. LL. B., (Cantab), Bar-at-law of Gujranwalla, who was sentenced by the Martial Law Tribunal (No 4) to transportation for life with forfeiture of property on the 17th June 1919, but whose sentence was subsequently reduced to 6 months has now been released. The release cannot, it is clear, bring any solace or

relief to a man who when in jail bravely said in his petition for justice: "No mere reduction of sentence, it is most humbly submitted, can be a consolation to Your Excellency's memorialist or in an adequate measure will right the wrong that has been done him or meet the ends of justice." It will be remembered that Mr. Labhsingh was convicted and sentenced on the testimony of an approver whom he and his co-accused were not permitted to cross-examine regarding character, and even then all that the Judges had to say regarding Mr. Labhsingh was, "Labhsingh, accused 4, took an active part in the inception of the agitation against the Rowlatt Act and was present at meetings of the 12th and the 13th. On the latter date he *is said to have* at first opposed, the commission of acts of violence, *but finally agreed*. He was seen in several places with the mob on the 14th but appears to have rendered assistance to the authorities on that date. We find him guilty under section 121 I. P. C." It is beyond our purpose here to make more than a passing mention of this, which is only to remind the readers of the glaring injustice that Mr. Labhsingh has suffered. The whole case was dealt with at length in our issue of September 17. The thing to be borne in mind is that the reduction of sentences and subsequent release, with the conviction still standing against the accused, only "confirm and perpetuate," in the words of Mr. Labhsingh, "what is a grave and serious miscarriage of justice." There must be numerous other instances in which such injustice has been perpetuated. We cannot sleep over them. It will be shirking an obvious and plain duty if the public were to rest silent and satisfied so long

as the *convictions* against those of our innocent countrymen in the Punjab continue to stand. Nor can Government afford to allow these wounds to fester for ever.

THE KASUR INCIDENT

(December 10, 1919.)

If we may generalise from a particular instance the Kasur incident, of which the description is given in a letter to the "Tribune," reproduced elsewhere, * and fully confirmed by Mr. Gandhi shows that officers in the Punjab are prone to use force on the merest shadow of provocation. But the significance of the incident small

* The following account given by Mr. Gandhi of a Kasur incident fully corroborates the account given by a correspondent to the "Tribune" and printed elsewhere. "I had received a telegram from Kasur that a Musalman was severely beaten by the Sub-Divisional officer there for a Khilafat placard stuck on his wall. The man had not stuck the placard at all, and it was harmless. I thought this was a serious affair. That British officers could take the law in their own hands and commit, a criminal offence, should be intolerable. I therefore visited Kasur in company with Dr. Parasram and took the statements of two Musalmans who were beaten by the Sub-Divisional officer. In the meantime I received a note from Mr. Marsden, the S. D. O. asking me to see him. He said in the course of his conversation that he had apologised to the Musalman and paid Rs. 10 to him as compensation. I told him that as he had publicly beaten the Musalman he should also publicly apologise. He agreed to my publicly expressing his regret. The notices were also restored on the wall. Just after this visit I had to address a big public meeting attended by about three thousand men and women. I expressed to them Mr. Marsden's unconditional regret and the people were greatly satisfied."

though it was, lies elsewhere. Mr. Marsden did no doubt take the law into his own hands, but hastened to make what reparation he could. He did not resent the presence of Mr. Gandhi, as an unwarranted interference into local affairs, had not only the grace to invite Mr. Gandhi to explain the matter, but the further grace to accept Mr. Gandhi's suggestion that the reparation he had made was not adequate, unless there was a public expression of regret, for an offence committed in public and the still further grace to authorise Mr. Gandhi to publish his regret for what he had done. On the other hand the public expression of regret was sufficient to satisfy the people, who welcomed it, and have not only forgiven the officer and forgotten the incident, but probably think more highly of him than before. The moral is obvious. Patient truth must tell. The public instead of taking any precipitate action calmly pointed out to the officer his mistake, he had to admit it and made sufficient amends for it. For the ruling class there could be no better instance of the triumph of regard for truth. Mr. Marsden had committed no doubt a grave mistake, but having admitted the mistake found a public ready to respect him all the more.

If instances as these were more common in India good will between the rulers and the ruled would be the rule, and ill will and consequent disturbances a thing of the past.

GENERAL DYER.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 14, 1920.)

The Army Council has found General Dyer* guilty of error of judgment and advised that he should not receive any office under the Crown. Mr. Montagu has been unsparing in his criticism of General Dyer's conduct. And yet somehow or other I cannot help feeling that General Dyer is by no means the worst offender. His brutality is unmistakable. His abject and unsoldier-like cowardice is apparent in every line of amazing defence before the Army Council. He has called an unarmed crowd of men and children—mostly holiday-makers—'a rebel army.' He believes himself to be the saviour of the Punjab in that he was able to shoot down like rabbits men who were penned in an inclosure. Such a man is unworthy

*Writing about the House of Lords, decision about General Dyer, "Young India" said on August 18, 1920 :—

The House of Lords has acquitted General Dyer. Yet this was the tribunal to which most of our countrymen in their utter simplicity vociferously demanded to appeal. An impeachment is nothing but a trial by the House of Lords according to legal forms, the judgment being by a vote of the Peers. We now know to our bitter experience, as we have known of similar instances in the past, how even an impeachment must end. The truth is that we should learn to be content with our own dispassionate and well-considered judgment and not hunger for the decision of a law-court, especially when we know that it is after all the offenders themselves that sit as a court. For it is the unchristianised brute spirit of the West, more brutalised than ever by the successes and failures of the last war, that ran riot in April 1919 and sought to protect itself by killing bodies and souls in the Punjab and again with imperialistic caution affected to make amends in the Commons, but the spirit could not rest till it frankly let itself out in the Lords.

of being considered a soldier. There was no bravery in his action. He ran no risk. He shot without the slightest opposition and without warning. This is not an 'error of judgment'. It is paralysis of it in the face of fancied danger. It is proof of criminal incapacity and heartlessness. But the fury that has been spent upon General Dyer is, I am sure, largely misdirected. No doubt the shooting was 'frightful', the loss of innocent life deplorable. But the slow torture, degradation and emasculation that followed was much worse, more calculated, malicious and soul-killing, and the actors who performed the deeds deserve greater condemnation than General Dyer for the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre. The latter merely destroyed a few bodies but the others tried to kill the soul of a nation. Whoever talks of Col. Frank Johnson who was by far the worst offender? He terrorised guiltless Lahore, and by his merciless orders set the tone to the whole of the Martial Law officers. But what I am concerned with is not even Col. Johnson. The first business of the people of the Punjab and of India is to rid the service of Col. O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Shri Ram and Mr. Malik Khan. They are still retained in the service. Their guilt is as much proved as that of General Dyer. We shall have failed in our duty if the condemnation pronounced upon General Dyer produces a sense of satisfaction and the obvious duty of purging the administration in the Punjab is neglected. That task will not be performed by platform rhetoric or resolutions merely. Stern action is required on our part if we are to make any head-way with ourselves and make any impression

upon the officials that they are not to consider themselves as masters of the people but as their trustees and servants who cannot hold office if they misbehave themselves and prove unworthy of the trust reposed in them.

JALLIANWALA BAGH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 18, 1920.)

There was an unfortunate hitch about the purchase of this Bagh* for the nation. Thanks to the efforts of the Hon'ble Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya,

* Mr. Gandhi, in his letter to the *Navajivan* thus speaks about the Jallianwalla Bagh :—The, name 'Jallianwalla Bagh' is a misnomer. "Jallian" is a surname, and the original owner of the place was a 'Jallian'. The 'Bagh' is to—day the joint property of about 40 partners. It is not a 'Bagh' or garden, but a dung hill. It is hemmed in on all sides by the back walls of houses and people have made it a convenient place to throw house-refuse in, from back windows. It is an open space with three trees and a tomb, and is accessible by a narrow lane. General Dyer used this lane to approach the Bagh. The people who were attending the meeting in the Bagh on the 13th April were thus penned up, and had no way of escape except at three or four places by jumping walls. Thousands escaped with their lives by jumping the walls on that fateful day.

Torrents of innocent blood have hallowed this ground.) Attempts are being made to purchase it for public purposes and if we do not succeed it will be a shame to us—

We may add to this the *Times of India* correspondents' description :

"Thousands are paying visits to Jallianwalla Bagh which is a large open space surrounded on all sides by dwelling houses with two or three bottlenecked entrances to it. Some of the walls of houses round about bear marks of the bullets fired from the machine guns and attract the attention of the sightseers visiting the scene."

Sanyasi Swami Shri Shraddhananda and the local leaders, it has now become the property of the nation subject to the full payment of the purchase price within three months from the 6th instant. The purchase price is Rs. 5,36,000. And the amount must be raised within the prescribed period.

It is, therefore, necessary to examine the propriety of making this purchase on behalf of the nation, especially as it has been questioned even in enlightened quarters. With the Cawnpore Memorial before us the attitude is not to be wondered at. But with all respect to objectors, I cannot help saying that if the Bagh had not been acquired, it would have been a national disgrace. Can we afford to forget those five hundred or more men who were killed although they had done nothing wrong either morally or legally? if they had died knowingly and willingly, if realising their innocence they had stood their ground and faced the shots from the fifty rifles, they would have gone down to history as saints, heroes and patriots. But even as it was, the tragedy became one of first class national importance. Nations are born out of travail and suffering. We should forfeit all title to be considered a nation, if we failed to treasure the memory of those, who in our battle for political freedom might innocently or for the crimes of others, lose their lives or otherwise suffer. We were unable to protect our helpless countrymen when they were ruthlessly massacred. We may decline, if we will, to avenge the wrong. The nation will not lose if we did. But shall we—can we afford to—decline to perpetuate the memory and

to show to the surviving members of the families of the dead that we are sharerers in their sufferings, by erecting a national tombstone and by telling the world thereby that in the death of these men each one of us has lost dear relations? If national instinct does not mean at least this much kinship, it has no meaning for me. I hold it to be our duty to tell the present generations yet unborn that in our march towards true freedom we must be prepared for repetitions of the wrongs such as the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. We must provide against them, we must not seek them, but we must be ready to face them if they came again. I would not have us flinch from the battle of national life. The supreme lesson of the Amritsar Congress was that the sufferings of the Punjab did not dishearten the nation but that the nation treated them as a matter of course. Some of us made stupid mistakes and the innocent suffered for them. We must in future try to avoid the mistakes but in spite of our best effort, we may fail to convert every one to sanity. We must, therefore, be ready for the repetition of the sufferings of the guiltless by telling the country now that they and theirs shall not be forgotten but that the memory of the innocent dead shall be regarded as a sacred trust and that the surviving relations shall have the right to look to the nation for maintenance in case of need. This is the primary meaning of the memorial. And has not the blood of the Mahomedan mixed with that of the Hindu? Has not the blood of the Sikh mixed with that of the Sanatanist and the Samajist? The memorial should be a national emblem of an honest and sustained effort to achieve Hindu-Muslim unity.

But the objector's objection still remains unanswered. Will not the memorial also perpetuate bitterness and ill will? It will depend upon the trustees. And if I know them, I know that that is not their intention at all. I know that such was not the intention of the vast assembly. I do not wish to convey that bitterness was not there. It was there not in any way suppressed. But the idea of the memorial had nothing of bitterness in it. The people want to, they must be encouraged to forget the doer and his madness. What General Dyer did we may all do if we had his irresponsibility and opportunity. To err is human and it must be held to be equally human to forgive if we though being fallible would like rather to be forgiven than punished and reminded of our misdeeds. Nor does this mean that we may not ask for General Dyer's dismissal. A lunatic cannot be kept in a position from which he can do harm to his neighbours. But just as we do not bear ill-will towards a lunatic, so too may we not bear ill-will even towards General Dyer. I would therefore eschew from the memorial all idea of bitterness and ill-will but treat it as a sacred memory and regard the Bagh as a place of pilgrimage to be visited by all irrespective of class, creed or colour. I would invite Englishmen to appreciate our feeling in the matter, ask them by subscribing to the memorial in the spirit of the Royal Proclamation to make common cause with us in our endeavour to regain consciousness, to realise the same freedom that they enjoy under the same constitution and to realise Hindu-Muslim unity without which there can be no true progress for India.

A PUNJAB VICTIM

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 15, 1919.)

Behari Lal Sachdeva is a young man of twenty-four with a young wife and an aged father seventy two years old. He belongs to the Gujranwala batch and was sentenced to transportation with forfeiture of property * He had "waged war against the king." So said the prosecution and so found the court. His Honour the Lieut. Governor has commuted the sentence to that of four years' imprisonment. Poor comfort to a prisoner who is innocent or to his father who is on the verge of death.

And so poor Behari Lal Sachdeva has sent another petition as "he believes that through some serious mistake his case has not been carefully gone into." The petition is convincing enough. It is so well drawn that it will repay perusal. It is almost free from rhetoric or superfluous adjectives and is brief enough even for a busy reader.

A friend told me the other day that after forty years of life devoted to the praising of British justice, the Punjab had undeceived him. He no longer believed in British

* Extract from his second petition to the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab :

"That Your Honour's humble petitioner was tried along with 14 others, on charges under sections 121, 121 A, 124, etc., by the Martial Law Commission No. IV, presided over by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Broadway, in what is known as the Gujranwala Leader (conspiracy) Case, and sentenced on the 17th June 1919 to transportation for life and forfeiture of property, and which has subsequently been reduced to four years imprisonment by Your Honour."

justice. He added with distinct energy, "I do not care a straw for your reforms: what can they do for us if our lives and our honour be not safe and we stand in peril of being wrongly imprisoned?"

Well, the case of Behari Lal Sachdeva seems to be one such. It is probably one of mistaken identity. The young man would appear to be perfectly innocent. The prisoner is not stated to have been connected with or present at the meeting on the 4th and the 5th April or on the 12th or the 13th April. The principal witness's evidence is merely hearsay. The other evidence is stated to be tainted, and even if true, the facts sworn to do not disclose any offence. The evidence given for the prisoner by respectable and impartial witnesses was discarded by the court. The reader has by this time known sufficient of the Punjab judgments not to feel surprised at such attitude of the special courts. What is however surprising is the fact that even now when perfect quiet reigns in the Punjab these cases of injustice do not receive the attention they deserve at the hands of the Lieut. Governor. No government deserves respect which holds cheap the liberty of the subject as the Punjab Government seems to do.

A HARD CASE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*May 26, 1920.*)

I have received the following telegram from the families of Messrs. Bugga and Ratanchand.

“Bugga and Ratto under orders transfer Andamans. Bugga suffering hernia and piles since ten years. Was operated upon. Ratto aged over forty and therefore should not be sent Andamans under Jail Manual Rule 721.”

The readers will remember that these were the accused on whose behalf appeals were made to the Privy Council in common with others and whose appeals were rejected on technical grounds. The Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru has analysed the cases and shown that they are no more guilty than the others who have been discharged. But several who were originally sentenced to death had their sentences commuted to imprisonment and are now set free. What is it that distinguishes these two cases from the others? Is it the fact of the appeal itself? If they had not appealed or rather a philanthropic lawyer out of pity had not taken up their case, fought for them against tremendous odds, they would not have escaped the hangman's horse? H. H. the Lieut. Governor of the Punjab has been showing a generous discretion in releasing many who suffered between April and June last year. Although he had the opportunity after the dismissal of the appeal, to hang Messrs. Bugga and Ratanchand, H. E. the Viceroy, it is equally true, has commuted the sentence of death to one of transportation. But I venture to submit that if the Royal Proclamation is to be given effect to in the fullest measure, Messrs. Bugga and Ratanchand are entitled to their liberty. They are no more danger to the State than Lala Harkishenlal, Pandit Rambhuj Datta Chaudri and others of that distinguished

company. But for the time being, strong as the case is for their discharge, I am pleading not for a complete release but for keeping them in the Punjab and if they have been sent away already for bringing them back, if for nothing else, out of consideration for the wives of these poor men. Let not the public think that the acts of the Government of the day are dictated only by fear and expedience not by logic and high principles of justice.

A SUPERINTENDENT'S ORDER.

(July 14, 1920.)

Mr. Gandhi writes to the press :—
(The Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyya has handed to me an order signed by Mr. F. A. Heron, the Superintendent of Police, Gujranwala (Punjab). The Panditji has given it to me for publication with such criticism as I could offer out of my experience of the Gujranwala district, the whole of which I visited during my stay in the Punjab. The order is dated the 5th June 1919. It may be recalled that Superintendent Heron it was who directed the firing when one of the Railway bridges was set fire to by a Gujranwala crowd on the 14th April 1919. Here is the order in question :

ORDER.

To the Sub-Inspector of Police,

Dated Gujranwala, the 5th of June 1919.

It is now practically certain that Martial Law will be taken off in this district, from those towns upon which

it is still in force in a few days. The result of this will be that only those cases actually at the time of removal of Martial Law then under trial before the Martial Law Commissions will be allowed to continue to be tried under Martial Law.

All other cases whether under investigation or under trial before a Summary court will have to be dropped and can then only be tried under the ordinary law. This will mean greatly prolonging these cases as under the ordinary law cases will proceed slowly in court and there will be appeals etc. It is therefore imperative that all cases now ready for trial in the Summary courts should be sent up for trial immediately and that all cases still under investigation which can be completed rapidly should be completed immediately and sent up for trial. In this district so far the police have sent up comparatively few cases for trial and so there must be many persons who are guilty and against whom there is proof available who should be sent up for trial without delay.

Great efforts must now be made to complete all pending cases at once. Identification parades should be held immediately and every endeavour must be made to call up new witnesses etc., who can help in proving the guilt of the accused.

Proper attention has not so far been paid to securing the arrests of absconders. This must now be done. Constables, Sufedposhes etc., should now be sent out immediately after absconders and every effort made to capture them at once. It is not sufficient merely to send a Ruqua to some police stations for their arrests.

I need not impress upon my officers the great necessity

of completing their cases at once and of getting a sufficient number of accused dealt with before Martial Law is removed. This district in point of view of numbers sent up for trial is far behind other districts and this naturally arouses criticisms on the efficiency and energy shown by the police here. Something can still be done to improve matters and if all my officers put their hearts into the work there is no reason why the reputation of all the investigating staff here should suffer in comparison with those who have investigated in Lahore and Amritsar, but should the numbers sent up for trial continue so small all concerned will undoubtedly not receive the *Qadar* and respect they are in some instances entitled to.

5—6—1919

(Sd.) F. A. HERON,

Superintendent of Police, Gujranwala.

Scores of witnesses in the district gave evidence before the Congress Sub-Committee that during the last days of Martial Law, batches after batches of prisoners were hurried to the Summary courts so-called. The presiding officers sat late at night and without even examining defence witnesses condemned absolutely innocent men to varying terms of imprisonment. One of the officers who thus conducted trials was Col. O'Brien, and the other was Mr. Bosworth Smith. The order reproduced above adds emphasis to the evidence recorded by the Congress Committee and throws a lurid light on the way in which prosecutions took place. And it was in this summary and hasty manner that men who were absolutely innocent of any crime were harrassed and imprisoned at Akalgarh, Ramanagar, and other places, and still these officials retain their offices and the power of doing evil.)

ANOTHER MARTIAL LAW CASE FROM THE PUNJAB

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 29, 1919.)

Mr. Parshotam Singh, son of Mr. Jamiat Singh Bagga, of Wazirabad, has sent me a statement of his father's case, and what is miscalled record of his case and judgment. Mr. Jamiat Singh Bagga is a merchant and banker of Wazirabad. He is 62 years old and suffering from a bad cataract in the eye. He was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1,000 or in default to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for 6 months. I have no hesitation in saying that the judgment is utterly unworthy of anybody calling himself a judge. It is devoid of reasoning and full of imputations and bad logic ; and if the facts set forth in the son's statement are true, the convicting Magistrate is utterly unfit to sit as a judge. Mr. Jamiat Singh's crime seems to have been that he was present at the mosque meeting and advocated *Hartal*, and that he was a rich man, for the Magistrate disbelieves the testimony of impartial witnesses because " Jamiat Singh is a rich man." It is sufficient for the Magistrate that the accused was with the mob that stoned the troopers, that " if he prevented boys from breaking fencing, there may have been some other reason, but he certainly was in the mob ". Thus everything in favour of the accused is deliberately disregarded by the Magistrate. The reader must go through the judgment to feel the force of my remarks regarding its incoherence. But the son's statement makes what seems apparently to

be an injustice appear blacker still. Is it true that the Magistrate confiscated the accused's property without a moment's notice, that the inmates were subjected to the treatment described in the statement, and if it is true, was it not a lawless act? Is it true that the witnesses cited for the defence were not called, that the defence counsel was not allowed to appear, when the charge was framed against the accused? So much for the precious judgment.

The treatment received by the accused before and after judgment seems to have been in keeping with the proceedings of the court. It was an inhuman act to make him walk handcuffed with his bedding under his armpit. It reminds one of General Hudson's speech about the hand and knee order, which, by the way, should be, according to the correction made by Pandit Jowahirlal Nehru, described as the crawling order. It is evident that the proceedings taken by the authorities were intended, like the crawling order, to produce an impression on the people. It is difficult on any other ground to understand the insulting and cruel treatment to which the accused was subjected. Even the help he rendered the Government during the war period by subscribing the largest amount in Wazirabad to the war loan, and by recruiting, was of no avail. The *Sanad* granted to him for his loyal services was of no service to him when he was put in the dock, and treated as a common felon.

I cannot congratulate the Punjab Government on the reduction of the sentence to six months, when the accused seems clearly to be entitled to a full discharge. The case, as appears from the statement,

is now to be investigated by the Revision Judges. I have already ventured to express my misgivings about this Revision Tribunal. Its composition cannot inspire any confidence or hope. If the Government fail to repair the irreparable mistakes, create tribunals merely in order to cover themselves, they will forfeit all title to respect and intelligent co-operation. The dead are buried and gone, but it is intolerable that the living, who are now suffering undeserved punishment, are not given an opportunity of showing their innocence before a tribunal in which they and the public can have full confidence.

THE AMRITSAR APPEALS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 3, 1920.)

So these appeals have been dismissed in spite of the advocacy of the best counsel that were obtainable. The Privy Council has confirmed lawless procedure. I must confess that the judgment does not come upon me quite as a surprise, though the remarks of the judges as Sir Simon was developing his argument on behalf of the appellants, led one to expect a favourable verdict. My opinion based upon of a study of political cases is that the judgments even of the highest Tribunals are not unaffected by subtle political considerations. The most elaborate precautions taken to procure a purely judicial mind must break down at critical moments. The Privy Council cannot be free from the limitations of all human institu-

tions which are good enough only for normal conditions. The consequences of a decision favourable to the people would have exposed the Indian Government to indescribable discredit from which it would have been difficult to free itself for a generation.)

Its political significance can be gauged from the fact that as soon as the news was received in Lahore all the preparations that were made to accord a fitting welcome to Lala Lajpatrai were immediately cancelled and the Capital of the Punjab was reported to be in deep mourning. Deeper discredit, therefore, now attaches to the Government by reason of the judgment, because rightly or wrongly the popular opinion will be that there is no justice under the British constitution when large political or racial considerations are involved.

There is only one way to avoid the catastrophe. The human and especially the Indian mind quickly responds to generosity. I hope that without the necessity of an agitation or petitions the Punjab Government or the Central Government will immediately cancel the death sentences and if at all possible, simultaneously set the appellants free.

This is required by two considerations each equally important. The first is that of restoring public confidence which I have already mentioned. The second is fulfilment of the Royal Proclamation to the letter. That great political document orders the release of all the political offenders who may not by their release prove a danger to society. No one can possibly suggest that the twenty-one appellants will, if they are set free, in any shape or form constitute a danger to

society. They never had committed any crimes before. Most of them were regarded as respectable and orderly citizens. They were not known to belong to any revolutionary society. If they committed any crimes at all, they were committed only under the impulse of the moment and under what to them was grave provocation. Moreover, the public believe that the majority of the convictions by the Martial Law Tribunals were unsupported by any good evidence. I, therefore, hope that the Government, which have so far been doing well in discharging political offenders even when they were caught in the act, will not hesitate to release these appellants and thus earn the goodwill of the whole of India. It is an act of generosity done in the hour of triumph which is the most effective. And in the popular opinion this dismissal of the appeal has been regarded as a triumph for the Government.

I would respectfully plead with the Punjab friends not to lose heart. We must calmly prepare ourselves for the worst. If the convictions are good, if the men convicted have been guilty of murders or incitements to murder, why should they escape punishment? If they have not committed these crimes as we believe most at least have not, why should we escape the usual fate of all who are trying to rise a step higher? Why should we fear the sacrifice if we would rise? No nations have ever risen without sacrifice and sacrifice can only be spoken of in connection with innocence and not with crime.

A CAREER OF HATRED AND REPRESSION

(November 12, 1919)

Sir Sankaran Nair who while in India chose to be reticent about the circumstances that led to his resignation, has made them sufficiently clear in his article on "Discontent and Repression in India" in Mrs. Besant's new weekly *United India*. * It is obvious that the repressive policy of the Government, of which he had to be an unwilling participant, was on his nerves and he was entirely sick of it when, as he tell us, it "culminated in the so-called Punjab outbreak, where we had to apply Martial Law, on the ground that the lives of the Englishmen were not safe and that rebellion had broken out". "Be it remembered", he reminds us in a graphic maner, "that the Punjab had the reputation of being the most loyal province in all India, yet the head of the province who was never tired of contrasting in season and out of season the sacrifices made by the Punjab and its loyalty with the agitation for Home Rule carried on in the rest of India, had to leave that province like a thief in the night, after proclaiming Martial Law in that district." No Government, he concedes, can abstain from taking necessary steps for the protection of its law-abiding citizens, but ~~no~~ Government, he emphasises, "can continue in a career of repression and of hatred of the people it rules," and "a continuance of repression is proof of bankruptcy of statesmanship". "Provocation on the one side, retaliation on the other, this deadlock between repression and crime each fol-

* *United India* was a weekly published in London, now defunct,

lowing the other in endless succession, cannot be tolerated." These are words which should make both the Government and the British nation pause and ponder and take prompt action, unless they want people to believe that they have bid goodbye to their senses. They must no longer blink at the evil that lies at the root of the situation. Sir Sankaran makes it clear at the conclusion of his article, "No measure calculated to deprive a man of the liberty of his person or property, no measure suppressing freedom of speech in any form should be allowed to be passed by the Executive Government in India without Indian opinion thereon being considered by the public of Britain." Read between the lines, Sir Sankaran Nair's article is a warning to Britain that if it at all cares to redeem the position and prestige of the Government of India, and restore the faith of the Indian people in British justice, it should no longer tolerate the existence of the Rowlatt Act on the Statute Book, and the shame of the Punjab—the shame of the crimes committed in the name of law and order and of the many miscarriages of justice perpetrated in the name of justice.

WHAT ABOUT GENERAL DYER ?

(March 16, 1921.)

Why all the recalling incessantly of Jallianwala Bagh and the Crawling Lane, asks (a) friend ? The answer is simple. To forgive is not to forget. There is no merit in loving an enemy when you forget him for a friend.

The merit lies in loving inspite of the vivid knowledge that the one that must be loved is not a friend. Ali, that Bayard of Islam, would not retaliate whilst the memory of a vile affront was still fresh in his mind and although he was more than a match for his adversary, India seeks not punishment of the criminals, Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer but dismissal of servants who have proved unworthy of the trust reposed in them. And they are not fully dismissed so long as they receive any pension from the Indian treasury. A father is not only not bound to feed an unrepentant son but participates in his crime if he continues to support him.

(The Congress Commissioners had their choice either to advise impeachment and prosecution or mere dismissal. They chose the latter on the grounds of humanity and not on that of expedience. The reader may be let into the secret that the Commissioners passed many an anxious hour over the matter. The report was finally shaped at Kashi within a stone's throw of the waters of the Ganges. The recommendation was hotly debated among them and they came to the unanimous conclusion that India could only gain by refraining from prosecution. Mr. Das in a notable speech at Patna recently referred to the compact then made between the Commissioners that, whilst and if they reduced their recommendation to a minimum, they must solemnly resolve to enforce them at the risk of their lives.) The Commissioners are therefore non-co-operators as a matter of simple duty. But they chose to waive the right of punishment. It is true that the whole of India has not yet deliberately accepted the doctrine of humanity *i. e.*

forgiveness. One often hears the talk of hanging the murderers and so on. But India does not yet feel strong as against British Governors and Generals. She still fears them. Forgiveness of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer is therefore a meaningless term. But India is daily gaining strength and qualifying for forgiveness. When an Indian talks of punishment of the Punjab criminals, he talks in impotent rage. But I am convinced that if India was to-day free *i. e.*, strong enough to punish them, she would refrain. She only wants her deliverance from possibilities of Jallianwala. The whole campaign of Non-co-operation has been conceived in a spirit not of revenge but of justice.

THE DUTY OF THE PUNJABEE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 23, 1920.)

The Allahabad *Leader* deserves to be congratulated for publishing the correspondence on Mr. Bosworth Smith who was one of the Martial Law officers against whom the complaints about persistent and continuous ill-treatment were among the bitterest. It appears from the correspondence that Mr. Bosworth Smith has received promotion instead of dismissal. Sometime before Martial Law Mr. Smith appears to have been degraded. "He has since been restored", says the *Leader* correspondent, "to his position of a Deputy Commissioner of the second grade from which he was degraded and also been invested with powers under sec. 30 of the Criminal Procedure

Code. Since his arrival, the poor Indian population of the town of Ambala Cantonment has been living under a regime of horror and tyranny." The correspondent adds "I use both these words deliberately for conveying precisely what they mean." I cull a few passages from this illuminating letter to illustrate the meanings of horror and tyranny. "In private complaints he never takes the statement of the complainant. It is taken down by the reader when the court rises and got signed by the magistrate the following day. Whether the Report (received upon such complaints) is favourable to the complainant or unfavourable to him it is never read by the magistrate, and complaints are dismissed without proper trial. This is the fate of private complaints. Now as regards police challans. Pleaders for the accused are not allowed to interview undertrial prisoners in police custody. They are not allowed to cross-examine prosecution witnesses. * * * Prosecution witnesses are examined with leading questions. * * * Thus a whole prosecution story is put into the mouth of police witnesses. Witnesses for the defence though called in are not allowed to be examined by the defence counsel. * * * The accused is silenced if he picks up courage to say anything in defence. * * * Any Cantonment servant can write down the name of any citizen of the Cantonment on a chit of paper and ask him to appear the next day in court. This is a summons. * * * If any one does not appear in court who is thus ordered, criminal warrants of arrest are issued against him." There is much more of this style in the letter which is worth producing, but I

have given enough to illustrate the writer's meaning. Let me turn for a while to this official's record during Martial Law. He is the official who tried people in batches and convicted them after a farcical trial. Witnesses have deposed to his having assembled people, having asked them to give false evidence, having removed women's veils, called them 'flies, bitches, she-asses' and having spat upon them. He it was who subjected the innocent pleaders of Shekhupura to indescribable persecution. Mr. Andrews personally investigated complaints against this official and came to the conclusion that no official had behaved worse than Mr. Smith. He gathered the people of Shekhupura, humiliated them in a variety of ways, called them 'suvarlog,' 'gandi makkhi.' His evidence before the Hunter Commission betrays his total disregard for truth and this is the officer who, if the correspondent in question has given correct facts, has been promoted. The question however is why he is at all in Government service and why he has not been tried for assaulting and abusing innocent men and women.

I notice a desire for the impeachment of General Dyer and Sir Michael O'Dwyer. I will not stop to examine whether the course is feasible. I was sorry to find Mr. Shastriar joining this cry for the prosecution of General Dyer. If the English people will willingly do so, I would welcome such prosecutions as a sign of their strong disapproval of the Jallianwalla Bag atrocity, but I would certainly not spend a single farthing in a vain pursuit after the conviction of these men. Surely the public has received sufficient experience of the English mind. Practically the whole English Press has joined the conspiracy

to screen these offenders against humanity. I would not be party to make heroes of them by joining the cry for prosecution private or public. If I can only persuade India to insist upon their complete dismissal, I should be satisfied. But more than the dismissal of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer is necessary the peremptory dismissal, if not a trial, of Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Shri Ram and others mentioned in the Congress Sub-Committee's Report. Bad as General Dyer is I consider Mr. Smith to be infinitely worse and his crimes to be far more serious than the massacre of Jallianwalla Bag. General Dyer sincerely believed that it was a soldierly act to terrorise people by shooting them. But Mr. Smith was wantonly cruel, vulgar and debased. If all the facts that have been deposed to against him are true, there is not a spark of humanity about him. Unlike General Dyer he lacks the courage to confirm what he has done and wriggles when challenged. This officer remains free to inflict himself upon people who have done no wrong to him, and who is permitted to disgrace the rule he represents for the time being.

What is the Punjab doing? Is it not the clear duty of the Panjabis not to rest until they have secured the dismissal of Mr. Smith and the like? The Punjab leaders have been discharged in vain if they will not utilise the liberty they have received, in order to purge the administration of Messrs. Bosworth, Smith and Company. I am sure that if they will only begin a determined agitation they will have the whole India by their side. I venture to suggest to them that the best way to qualify for sending General Dyer to the gallows is to perform

the easier and the more urgent duty of arresting the mischief still continued by the officials against whom they have assisted in collecting overwhelming evidence.

MR. PENNINGTON'S OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

By M. K. GANDHI

(September 29, 1920.)

I gladly publish Mr. Pennington's letter * with its enclosure just as I have received them. Evidently Mr.

* MR PENNINGTON'S LETTER

TO

MR. GANDHI.

Dear Sir, I do not like your scheme for "boycotting" the Government of India under what seems to be the somewhat less offensive (though more cumbrous) name of "non-co-operation", but I have always given you credit for a genuine desire to carry out revolution by peaceful means and am astonished at the violence of the language you use in describing General Dyer on page 4 of your issue of the 14th July last. You begin by saying that he is "by no means the worst offender," and, so far, I am inclined to agree, though as there has been no proper trial of anyone it is impossible to apportion their guilt. but then you say "his brutality is unmistakable," "his abject and unsoldierlike cowardice is apparent," He has called an *unarmed crowd* of men and children—mostly holiday makers—a rebel army." "He believes himself to be the saviour of the Punjab in that he was able to shoot down like rabbits men who were *penned* in an enclosure; such a man is unworthy to be considered a soldier. There was no bravery in his action. He ran no risk. He shot without the slightest opposition and without warning. This is not an error of judgment. It is paralysis of it in the face of *fancied* danger. It is proof of criminal incapacity and heartlessness," etc.

You must excuse me for saying that all this is mere rhetoric unsupported by any proof, even where proof was possible. To begin with, neither you nor I were present at the Jallianwalla Bagh on that dreadful day—dreadful especially for General Dyer for whom you show no sympathy—and therefore cannot know for certain whether the crowd was

Pennington is not a regular reader of *Young India*, or he would have noticed that no one has condemned mob-outrages more than I have. He seems to think that the

or was not 'unarmed'. That it was an "illegal", because a "prohibited", assembly is evident, for it is absurd to suppose that General Dyer's 4½ hours march, through the city that very morning, during the whole of which he was warning the inhabitants against the danger of any sort of gathering, was not thoroughly well-known. You say they were "mostly holiday makers," but you give no proof, and the idea of holiday gathering in Amritsar just then is incredible. I cannot understand your making such a suggestion. General Dyer was not the only officer present on the occasion, and it is impossible to suppose that he would have been allowed to go on shooting into an innocent body of holiday-makers. Even the troops would have refused to carry out what might then have been not unfairly called a "massacre"

I notice that you never even allude to the frightful brutality of the mob which was immediately responsible for the punitive measures reluctantly adopted by General Dyer. Your sympathies seem to be only with the marderers, and I am not sanguine enough to suppose that my view of the case will have much influence with you. Still I am bound to do what I can to get at the truth, and enclose a copy of some notes I have had occasion to make. If you can publish an *exact* account of what happened at Amritsar on the 10th of April, 1919 and the following days, especially on the 13th, including the demonstration in favour of General Dyer, (if there was one,) I, for one as a mere seeker after the truth, should be very much obliged to you. Mere abuse is not convincing, as you so often observe in your generally reasonable paper.

Yours faithfully,

25 Victoria Road,
WORTHING,
Sussex.
27th Aug. 1920.

J. R. PENNINGTON I. C S (Ret) for 12 years
Chief Magistrate of Districts in the South of
India before reform, by assassination and other-
wise, became so fashionable.

P. S. Let us get the case in this way. General Dyer, acting as the only representative of Government on the spot, shot some hundreds of people, (some of them *perhaps* innocently mixed up in an illegal assembly,) in the *bona fide* belief that he was dealing with the remains of a very dangerous rebellion and was thereby saving the lives of very many thousands, and in the opinion of a great many people did actually save the city from falling in the hands of a dangerous mob.

article he has objected to was the only thing I have ever written on General Dyer. He does not seem to know that I have endeavoured with the utmost impartiality to examine the Jallianwala massacre. And he can see any day all the proof adduced by my fellow-commissioners and myself in support of our findings on the massacre. The ordinary readers of *Young India* knew all the facts and therefore it was unnecessary for me to support my assertions otherwise. But unfortunately Mr. Pennington represents the typical Englishman. He does not want to be unjust, nevertheless he is rarely just in his appreciation of world events because he has no time to study them except cursorily and that though a press whose business is to air only party views. The average Englishman therefore except in parochial matters is perhaps the least informed though he claims to be well-informed about every variety of interest. Mr. Pennington's ignorance is thus typical of the others and affords the best reason for securing control of our own affairs in our own hands. Ability will come with use and not by waiting to be trained by those whose natural interest is to prolong the period of tutelage as much as possible.

But to return to Mr. Pennington's letter he complains that there has been no 'proper trial of any one.' The fault is not ours. India has consistently and insistently demanded a trial of all the officers concerned in the crimes against the Punjab.

He next objects to the 'violence' of my language. If truth is violent, I plead guilty to the charge of violence of language. (But I could not, without doing violence to truth, refrain from using the language I have, regarding

General Dyer's action. It has been proved out of his own mouth or hostile witnesses :

- (1) That the crowd was unarmed.
- (2) That it contained children.
- (3) That the 13th was the day of Vaisakhi fair.
- (4) That thousands had come to the fair.
- (5) That there was no rebellion.
- (6) That during the intervening two days before the 'massacre' there was peace in Amritsar.
- (7) That the proclamation of the meeting was made the same day as General Dyer's proclamation.
- (8) That General Dyer's proclamation prohibited not meetings but processions or gatherings of 4 men on the streets and not in private or public places.
- (9) That General Dyer ran no risk whether outside or inside the city.
- (10) That he admitted himself that many in the crowd did not know anything of his proclamation.
- (11) That he fired without warning the crowd and even after it had begun to disperse. He fired in the backs of the people who were in flight.
- (12) That the men were practically penned in an enclosure.

In the face of these admitted facts I do call the deed a 'massacre'. The action amounted not to 'an error of judgment' but its 'paralysis in the face of fancied danger.'

I am sorry to have to say that Mr. Pennington's notes* betray as much ignorance as his letter.

Whatever was adopted on paper in the days of

* not included in this collection

Canning was certainly not translated into action in its full sense. 'Promises made to the ear were broken to the hope,' was said by a reactionary Viceroy. Military expenditure has grown enormously since the days of Canning.

The demonstration in favour of General Dyer is practically a myth.

No trace was found of the so-called Danda Fauj dignified by the name of bludgeon-army by Mr. Pennington. There was no rebel army in Amritsar. The crowd that committed the horrible murders and incendiarism contained no one community exclusively. The sheet was found posted only in Lahore and not in Amritsar. Mr. Pennington should moreover have known by this time that the meeting held on the 13th was held, among other things, for the purpose of condemning mob excesses. This was brought out at the Amritsar trial. Those who surrounded him could not stop General Dyer. He says he made up his mind to shoot in a moment. He consulted nobody. When the correspondent says that the troops would have objected to being concerned in 'what might in that case be not unfairly called a 'massacre', he writes as if he had never lived in India. I wish the Indian troops had the moral courage to refuse to shoot innocent unarmed men in full flight. But the Indian troops have been brought in too slavish an atmosphere to dare do any such correct act.

I hope Mr. Pennington will not accuse me again of making unverified assertions because I have not quoted from the books. The evidence is there for him to use. I can only assure him that the assertions are based on positive proofs mostly obtained from official sources.

Mr. Pennington wants me to publish an exact account of what happened on the 10th April. He can find it in the reports, and if he will patiently go through them he will discover that Sir Michael O'Dwyer and his officials goaded the people into frenzied fury—a fury which nobody, as I have already said, has condemned more than I have. The account of the following days is summed up in one word viz 'peace' on the part of the crowd disturbed by indiscriminate arrests, the massacre and the series of official crimes that followed.

I am prepared to give Mr. Pennington credit for seeking after the truth. But he has gone about it in the wrong manner. I suggest his reading the evidence before the Hunter Committee and the Congress Committee. He need not read the reports. But the evidence will convince him that I have understated the case against General Dyer.

When however I read his description of himself as "for 12 years Chief Magistrate of Districts in the South of India before reform, by assassination and otherwise, became so fashionable," I despair of his being able to find the truth. An angry or a biased man renders himself incapable of finding it. And Mr. Pennington is evidently both angry and biased. What does he mean by saying, "before reform by assassination and otherwise became so fashionable?" It ill becomes him to talk of assassination when the school of assassination seems happily to have become extinct. Englishmen will never see the truth so long as they permit their vision to be blinded by arrogant assumption of superiority or ignorant assumptions of infallibility.

A RUNNING SORE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 13, 1921.)

His excellency the Viceroy in his reply to the Liberal League Deputation from the United Provinces, delivered an address which was more cautious than his reply to Ahmadiyya Deputation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to remind His Excellency, that in it he has asked India to do the impossible. Liberals and Nationalists, co-operators and non-cooperators, Hindus, Mussalmans, Shikhs, Jains, Parsis, Christians, Jews and all who call themselves Indians insist, each in his own way, upon the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs being righted. His Excellency is still pressing the Khilafat claim. That is hopeful, in that he does not ask the Mussalmans of India and their Hindu and other countrymen to forget the Khilafat wrong. But he clearly asks us to forget the Punjab wrong. The task is as impossible as it would be for a physician to make a patient forget—except under the temporary influence of some stupefying drug—his painful disease. The Punjab wrong is like a running sore, and even as a running sore cannot be healed unless the whole of the poison is removed, so can the Punjab wrong not be forgotten and forgiven, unless and until the poison in the shape of pensions to and continued employment of unrepentant and faithless servants has been removed. Does Lord Reading imagine that India is reconciled to the translation of Mr. Thomson to a higher post? He asks us to give him and his Government credit for sincerity and honesty of purpose. He may have that

credit, but there arises immediately upon the grant of that credit the belief, that there is a fundamental difference between the Government's and the people's outlook upon vital matters. And so long as Lord Reading and his Government continue, be it ever so sincerely, to ask India to be reconciled to the retention on the pension list or on the service list of the names of those, who have from an Indian standpoint proved unworthy of the trust imposed in them, so long there can be no meeting-ground between the Government and the people. If we have even a semblance of responsibility given to us, surely we must have the right to dismiss from service those who have atrociously wronged us. To me it is a supreme test of responsibility—the righting of the two wrongs. The injustice of the Khilafat wrong is admitted. The atrocity in the Punjab is written in letters of blood. We admit that we did wrong in Amritsar, in Kasur, in Jallianwala and in Gujranwala. We have been made to pay for it heavily. We have been humiliated, kicked. Both the innocent and the guilty have been hanged. We have ourselves made a frank, free and open confession from many a platform. We ask for no humiliation of official wrong-doers. All we ask is that they may not be imposed upon us as masters. An English official once frankly told me, that rather than be party, by remaining in the service, to the removal from the Pension list of Sir Michael O'Dwyer or General Dyer, he would resign. I told him, that whilst I could see my way to sympathise with such an attitude, he must not expect me to agree with him. Nor did he. Hundreds, if not thousands of Englishmen and Englishwomen con-

sider Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer as saviours of the Empire and the honour of their kind. It is highly likely, that if I were an Englishman intent upon holding India at any cost, I would feel even as they. But I hold, that so long as that attitude is retained, so long must co-operation between the Government and the people be impossible. Non-co-operation alone can open the eyes of Englishmen to the fact, that co-operation with them in the Government of the country involves an acceptance of their attitude. But it is inconsistent with their position as friends and associates. They may not remain in India on the strength of their bayonets. They can remain only on the strength of our goodwill. That and that alone must be the binding force between them and us. Let them not mock us by professing equality on the lips and by maintaining behind their entrenchments an unassailable superiority. As a shrewd man of the world, Lord Reading, I hope, will soon recognise the impossibility of reconciling two opposite attitudes. Had there been a middle course, non-co-operators would have adopted it long ago. It is not a question of hatred or ill-will on the part of the vast mass of people. I invite him to drive the probe deep enough, and he would find that weak as we are, we can no longer tolerate the cult of White superiority. Lip professions, well meaning and sincere though they may be, can serve no useful purpose. We are idolatrous enough to demand ocular proof of equality. Does he not see, that the existence of white soldiers may be a necessity for the safety of Englishmen, never for the safety of the Indian Border? Englishmen must be prepared to live in

India precisely on the same terms as the Parsis. A mere handful of the latter have remained for the last thousand years as honoured friends and partners. They have needed no special protection, no fort to retire to in times of danger from enraged Hindus or Mussalmans. Have not the followers of Moses and Jesus the faith of those of Zoroaster? The plain fact is, that Englishmen are not prepared to remain in India on the sufferance of the millions of Hindus and Mussalmans. The latter are not prepared to give the former any advantageous position by reason of their controlling all the most destructive appliances that human ingenuity has ever invented. There is no choice before the latter but that of making a supreme effort to neutralise the effect of all those appliances by ceasing to fear them, i. e. by non-resistance. This may all appear to be arrogant or visionary. I hope, however, that Lord Reading at any rate will soon find that I have spoken the real mind of India. And the sooner this fundamental truth is realised, the sooner will there be real hearty co-operation between Englishmen and Indians. I am longing for such co-operation, and it's this very longing which deters me from accepting any apology, no matter how tempting, for co-operation. Non-Co-operation is not born of ignorance and ill-will, but it is the only effective step towards Co-operation and therefore it rises from knowledge and love.

PART III

The Khilafat Question

THE KHILAFAT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 28, 1920.)

The question of questions to-day is the Khilafat question, otherwise known as that of the Turkish peace terms. His Excellency the Viceroy deserves our thanks for receiving the joint deputation even at this late hour, especially when he was busy preparing to receive the heads of the different provinces. His Excellency must be thanked for the unfailing courtesy with which he received the deputation and the courteous language in which his reply was couched. But mere courtesy, valuable as it is at all times, never so valuable as at this, is not enough at this critical moment. 'Sweet words butter no parsnips' is a proverb more applicable to-day than ever before. Behind the courtesy there was the determination to punish Turkey. Punishment of Turkey is a thing which Muslim sentiment cannot tolerate for a moment. Muslim soldiers are as responsible for the result of the war as any others. It was to appease them that Mr. Asquith said when Turkey decided to join the Central Powers that the British Government had no designs on Turkey and that His Majesty's Government would never think of punishing the Sultan for the misdeeds of the Turkish Committee. Examined by that standard the Viceregal reply is not only disappointing but it is a fall from truth and justice.

What is this British Empire? It is as much Mahomedan and Hindu as it is Christian. Its religious neutrality is not a virtue, or if it is, it is a virtue of necessity. Such a mighty empire could not be held together on any other terms. British ministers are therefore bound to protect Mahomedan interests as any other. Indeed as the Muslim rejoinder says, they are bound to make the cause their own. What is the use of His Excellency having presented the Muslim claim before the Conference? If the cause is lost, the Mahomedans will be entitled to think that Britain did not do her duty by them. And the Viceregal reply confirms the view. When His Excellency says that Turkey must suffer for her having joined the Central Powers, he but expresses the opinion of the British ministers. We hope, therefore, with the framers of the Muslim rejoinder, that His Majesty's ministers will mend the mistakes if any have been committed and secure a settlement that would satisfy Mahomedan sentiment.

What does the sentiment demand? The preservation of the Khilafat with such guarantees as may be necessary for the protection of the interests of the non-Muslim races living under Turkish rule and the Khalif's control over Arabia and the Holy Places with such arrangement as may be required for guaranteeing Arab self-rule, should the Arabs desire it. It is hardly possible to state the claim more fairly than has been done. It is a claim backed by justice, by the declarations of British ministers and by the unanimous Hindu and Muslim opinion. It would be midsummer madness to reject or whittle down a claim so backed.

THE TURKISH QUESTION

(February 18, 1920.)

The Mahomedan leaders have been, as they ought to be, patiently but ably putting forward the justice of their cause. The dictates of justice, statesmanship and sentiment are all in their favour. Some from the other party, however, evade the issue of the principle of self-determination and enter into the labyrinth of the old records of Turkey. These impeachments also have not been left unanswered. Mr. Ameer Ali whose knowledge of history cannot be questioned even by the opposite party, in his letter to the *London Times*, writes: "The Ottoman State in the zenith of its power did good service to western Europe. In the 16th and 17th centuries, Turkey time after time came to the help of France when near being overwhelmed by the Hapsburgs. In 1857 Turkey opened Egypt to the passage of British troops to crush the great India Mutiny. In the conflict of the East India Company with Tipoo Sultan, Turkey stifled his efforts to make it a religious war.....The record of no nation is pure white.

Just the same issue about the old records of Turkey raises, in the opinion of the Dismemberment Party, another like issue in their favour. They state that "Constantinople in the hands of the Turks has been a constant 'apple of discord' to European nations." To this the Mahomedan leader asks: "Was not this discord due to the rivalry of ambitious European Powers as to who should possess himself of the apple?" Mr. Ammer Ali ventures to predict that "the settlement proposed will not put an end to

the discord; for the moment it would only shift the danger-spot from Europe to the East. Again, has 'international control' answered where it has been tried? I might refer to Tangier as an illustration." Mr. Edward G. Browne takes up the same argument and puts it to the Dismemberment Party: "Apart from the instance of Tangier, did the Anglo-French dual control in Egypt work so harmoniously that we should wish to try the experiment of a triple control in Constantinople?"

As distinguished from all these and other such arguments of the Partitionists a new and equally strange line of argument is put forward in a recent letter to the *Times* which appeared over the signatures of several eminent men. These latter correspondents do appreciate the Mahomedan sentiment in regard to the Khilafat question. They observe: "It is of vital importance that we should do nothing which would offend the religious sentiment of so large a proportion of the members of our commonwealth and of the French Empire." But we see the sting of their statement when we come to read their 'unique reasons' of justifying the internationalisation of Constantinople. They hope to reconcile the Mahomedans by pointing out that the city as the headquarters of the League of Nations would play a higher *role* than has ever been played by that ancient city or any other. 'From being the seat of the Sultan, it would become the world's Temple of Peace. They also venture to state that the internationalisation of Constantinople would once and for all settle the difficulty of its future ownership. In their anxiety to find out 'a home for the yet unborn League

of Nations, these men have forgotten altogether the principle of nationality. It is an unjust, impracticable and humorous optimism to expect to reconcile the Mahomedans to this scheme, especially in view of their present sentiments.'

'One of these unique reasons' for internationalising Constantinople is that there must be a place as the headquarters of the League of Nations, which owes allegiance to none but is the property of all. They cite as a precedent America's choosing Columbia as such a common place. Such a comparison with the America's state of politics as it stood after the War of Independence is quite inappropriate. And besides, we ask with Mr. Ameer Ali, why should not the Christian Powers choose Jerusalem? As to the impropriety of the demand of this Turkish capital for the League of Nations we need not go anywhere else for a parallel. Next to the League of Nations, our Empire is the greatest combination of nations. Have we made the headquarters of the Empire, viz, the city of London a common place *in the sense in which Constantinople is proposed to be made*? What has not become possible in smaller unions should not and cannot be so rashly attempted in the largest federation. Such an attempt would be not only unwise but unjust when it is to be risked at the cost of a distinct nationality.

All this varied opposition to the just demands of our Moslem brethren makes it evident for them what a huge task lies before them.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS

(March 10, 1919)

Mr. Gandhi writes to the Press as follows :

The Khilafat question has now become a question of questions. It has become an imperial question of the first magnitude.

The great Prelates of England and the Mahomedan leaders combined have brought the question to the fore. The Prelates threw down the challenge. The Muslim leaders have taken it up.

I trust that the Hindus will realize that the Khilafat question overshadows the Reforms and everything else.

If the Muslim claim was unjust apart from the Muslim scriptures, one might hesitate to support it merely on scriptural authority. But when a just claim is supported by scriptures, it becomes irresistible.

Briefly put the claim is that the Turks should retain European Turkey subject to full guarantees for the protection of non-Muslim races under the Turkish Empire and that the Sultan should control the Holy Places of Islam and should have suzerainty over Jazirat-ul-arab i. e. Arabia as defined by the Muslim Savants subject to self-governing rights being given to the Arabs if they so desire. This was what was promised by Mr. Lloyd George and this was what Lord Hardinge had contemplated. The Mahomedan soldiers would not have fought to deprive Turkey of her possessions. To deprive the Khalif of the suzerainty of Arabia is to reduce the Khilafat to a nullity.

To restore to Turkey subject to necessary guarantees

what was hers before war is a Christian solution. To wrest any of her possessions from her for the sake of punishing her is a gun-powder solution. The Allies or England in the hour of triumph must be scrupulously just. To reduce the Turks to impotence would be not only unjust. It would be a breach of solemn declarations and promises. It is to be wished that the Viceroy will take his courage in both his hands and place himself at the head of the Khilafat agitation as Lord Hardinge did at the time of the South African "passive-resistance" struggle and thus like his predecessor give a clear and emphatic direction to an agitation which under impulsive or faulty leadership may lead to disastrous consequences.

But the situation rests more with us Hindus and Mahomedans than with the Viceroy and still more with the Muslim leaders than with the Hindus or the Viceroy.

There are signs already of impatience on the part of Muslim friends and impatience may any day be reduced to madness and the latter must inevitably lead to violence. And I wish I could persuade every one to see that violence is suicide.

Supposing the Muslim demands are not granted by the Allies or say England! I see nothing but hope in Mr. Montagu's brave defence of the Muslim position and Mr. Lloyd George's interpretation of his own declaration. True, the latter is halting but he can secure full justice under it. But we must suppose the worst and expect and strive for the best. How to strive is the question.

What we may not do is clear enough.

(1) There should be no violence in thought, speech or deed.

(2) Therefore there should be no boycott of British goods, by way of revenge or punishment. Boycott in my opinion, is a form of violence. Moreover even if it were desirable, it is totally impracticable.

(3) There should be no rest till the minimum is achieved.

(4) There should be no mixing up of other questions with the Khilafat e. g. the Egyptian question.

Let us see what must be done:

1) The cessation of business on the 19th instant and expression of the minimum demands by means of one single resolution is a necessary first step provided that the Hartal is absolutely voluntary and the employees are not asked to leave their work unless they receive permission from their employers. I would strongly urge that the mill-hands should be left untouched. The further proviso is that there should be no violence accompanying the Hartal. I have been often told that the C. I. D. sometimes promote violence. I do not believe in it as a general charge. But even if it be true, our discipline should make it impossible. Our success depends solely on our ability to control, guide and discipline the masses.

Now a word as to what may be done if the demands are not granted. The barbarous method is warfare, open or secret. This must be ruled out if only because it is impracticable. If I could but persuade every one that it is always bad, we should gain all lawful ends much quicker. The power that an individual or a nation forswearing violence generates is a power that is irresistible. But my argument to-day against violence is based upon pure expedience i. e. its utter futility.

Non-co-operation is therefore the only remedy left open

to us. It is the cleanest remedy as it is the most effective, when it is absolutely free from all violence. It becomes a duty when co-operation means degradation or humiliation or an injury to one's cherished religious sentiment. England cannot accept a meek submission by us to an unjust usurpation of rights which to Mussalmans mean matter of life and death. We may therefore begin at the top as also the bottom. Those who are holding offices of honour or emolument ought to give them up. Those who belong to the menial services under Government should do likewise. Non-co-operation does not apply to services under private individuals. I cannot approve of the threat of ostracism against those who do not adopt the remedy of non-co-operation. It is only a voluntary withdrawal which is effective. For voluntary withdrawal alone is a test of popular feeling and dissatisfaction. Advice to the soldiers to refuse to serve is premature. It is the last, not the first step. We should be entitled to take that step when the Viceroy, the Secretary of State and the Premier leave us. Moreover every step in withdrawing co-operation has to be taken with the greatest deliberation. We must proceed slowly so as to ensure retention of self-control under the fiercest heat.

Many look upon the Calcutta resolutions with the deepest alarm. They sent in it a preparation for violence. I do not look upon them in that light, though I do not approve of the tone of some of them. I have already mentioned those whose subject matter I wholly dislike.

"Can Hindu accept all the resolutions,"? is the question addressed by some. I can only speak for myself. (I

will co-operate whole-heartedly with the Muslim friends in the prosecution of their just demands so long as they act with sufficient restraint and so long as I feel sure that they do not wish to resort to or countenance violence. I should cease to co-operate and advise every Hindu and for that matter every one else to cease to co-operate, the moment there was violence actually done, advised or countenanced. I would therefore urge upon all speakers the exercise of the greatest restraint under the gravest provocation. There is certainty of victory if firmness is combined with gentleness. The cause is doomed if anger, hatred, ill will, recklessness and finally violence are to reign supreme. I shall resist them with my life even if I should stand alone. My goal is friendship with the world and I can combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong.

WHY I HAVE JOINED THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 28, 1920.)

An esteemed South African friend who is at present living in England has written to me a letter from which I make the following excerpts :—

“ You will doubtless remember having met me in South Africa at the time when the Rev. J. J. Doke was assisting you in your campaign there and I subsequently returned to England deeply impressed with the rightness of your attitude in that country. During the months before war I

wrote and lectured and spoke on your behalf in several places which I do not regret. Since returning from military service, however, I have noticed from the papers that you appear to be adopting a more militant attitude.I notice a report in *The Times* that you are assisting and countenancing a union between the Hindus and Moslems with a view of embarrassing England and the Allied Powers in the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire or the ejection of the Turkish Government from Constantinople. Knowing as I do your sense of justice and your human instincts I feel that I am entitled, in view of the humble part that I have taken to promote your interests on this side, to ask you whether this latter report is correct. I cannot believe that you have wrongly countenanced a movement to place the cruel and unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government above the interests of humanity, for if any country has crippled these interests in the East it has surely been Turkey. I am personally familiar with the conditions in Syria and Armenia and I can only suppose that if the report which *The Times* has published is correct, you have thrown to one side your moral responsibilities and allied yourself with one of the prevailing anarchies. However, until I hear that this is not your attitude I cannot prejudice my mind. Perhaps you will do me the favour of sending me a reply."

I have sent a reply to the writer. But as the views expressed in the quotation are likely to be shared by many of my English friends and as I do not wish, if I can possibly help it, to forfeit their friendship or their esteem I shall endeavour to state my position as clearly

as I can on the Khilafat question. The letter shows what risk public men run through irresponsible journalism. I have not seen *The Times* report referred to by my friend. But it is evident that the report has made the writer to suspect my alliance with "the prevailing anarchies" and to think that I have "thrown to one side" my "moral responsibilities."

It is just my sense of moral responsibilities which has made me take up the Khilafat question and to identify myself entirely with the Mahomedans. It is perfectly true that I am assisting and countenancing the union between Hindus and Muslims, but certainly not with "a view of embarrassing England and the Allied Powers in the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire." It is contrary to my creed to embarrass governments or anybody else. This does not however mean that certain acts of mine may not result in embarrassment. But I should not hold myself responsible for having caused embarrassment when I resist the wrong of a wrong-doer by refusing assistance in his wrong-doing. On the Khilafat question I refuse to be party to a broken pledge. Mr. Lloyd George's solemn declaration is practically the whole of the case for Indian Mahomedans, and when that case is fortified by scriptural authority it becomes unanswerable. Moreover, it is incorrect to say that I have "allied myself to one of the prevailing anarchies" or that I have "wrongly countenanced the movement to place the cruel and unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government above the interests of humanity." In the whole of the Mahomedan demand here is no insistence on the retention of the so-called unjust despotism of the Stamboul Govern-

ment ; on the contrary the Mahomedans have accepted the principle of taking full guarantees from that Government for the protection of non-Muslim minorities. I do not know how far the condition of Armenia and Syria may be considered an 'anarchy' and how far the Turkish Government may be held responsible for it. I much suspect that the reports from these quarters are much exaggerated and that the European powers are themselves in a measure responsible for what misrule there may be in Armenia and Syria. But I am in no way interested in supporting Turkish or any other anarchy. The Allied Powers can easily prevent it by means other than that of ending Turkish rule or dismembering and weakening the Ottoman Empire. The Allied Powers are not dealing with a new situation. If Turkey was to be partitioned, the position should have been made clear at the commencement of the war. There would then have been no question of a broken pledge. As it is, no Indian Mahomedan has any regard for the promises of British Ministers. In his opinion, the cry against Turkey is that of Christianity *vs.* Islam with England as the leader in the cry. The latest cablegram from Mr. Mahomed Ali strengthens the impression, for he says that unlike as in England his deputation is receiving much support from the French Government and the people.

Thus, if it is true, as I hold it is true, that the Indian Mussalmans have a cause that is just and is supported by scriptural authority, then for the Hindus not to support them to the utmost would be a cowardly breach of brotherhood and they would forfeit all claim to consideration from their Mahomedan countrymen. As a public-server there-

fore, I would be unworthy of the position I claim, if I did not support Indian Mussalmans in their struggle to maintain the Khilafat in accordance with their religious belief. I believe that in supporting them I am rendering a service to the Empire, because by assisting my Mahomedan countrymen to give a disciplined expression to their sentiment it becomes possible to make the agitation thoroughly orderly and even successful.

KHILAFAT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 12, 1920.)

“As I told you in my last letter I think Mr. Gandhi has made a serious mistake in the Khilafat business. The Indian Mahomedans base their demand on the assertion that their religion requires the Turkish rule over Arabia; but when they have against them in this matter, the Arabs themselves, it is impossible to regard the theory of the Indian Mahomedans as essential to Islam. After all if the Arabs do not represent Islam, who does? It is as if the German Roman Catholics made a demand in the name of Roman Catholicism with Rome and the Italians making a contrary demand. But even if the religion of the Indian Mahomedans did require that Turkish rule should be imposed upon the Arabs against their will one could not, now-a-days, recognise as a really religious demand, one which required the continued oppression of one people by another. When an assurance was given at the beginning of the war to the Indian Mahomedans

that the Mahomedan religion would be respected, that could never have meant that a temporal sovereignty which violated the principles of self-determination would be upheld. We could not now stand by and see the Turks reconquer the Arabs (for the Arabs would certainly fight against them) without grossly betraying the Arabs to whom we have given pledges. It is not true that the Arab hostility to the Turks was due simply to European suggestion. No doubt, during the war we availed ourselves of the Arab hostility to the Turks to get another ally, but the hostility had existed long before the war. The non-Turkish Mahomedan subjects of the Sultan in general wanted to get rid of his rule. It is the Indian Mahomedans who have no experience of that rule who want to impose it on others. As a matter of fact the idea of any restoration of Turkish rule in Syria or Arabia seems so remote from all possibilities that to discuss it seems like discussing a restoration of the Holy Roman Empire. I cannot conceive what series of events could bring it about. The Indian Mahomedans certainly could not march into Arabia themselves and conquer the Arabs for the Sultan. And no amount of agitation and trouble in India would ever induce England to put back Turkish rule in Arabia. In this matter it is not English Imperialism which the Indian Mahomedans are up against, but the mass of English Liberal and Humanitarian opinion, the mass of the better opinion of England, which wants self-determination to go forward in India. Supposing the Indian Mahomedans could stir up an agitation so violent in India as to sever the connection between India and the British Crown, still they would not be any nearer to their pur-

pose. For to-day they do have considerable influence on British world-policy. Even if in this matter of the Turkish question their influence has not been sufficient to turn the scale against the very heavy weights on the other side, it has weighed in the scale. But apart from the British connection, the Indian Mahomedans would have no influence at all outside India. They would not count for more in world politics than the Mahomedans of China. I think it is likely (apart from the pressure of America on the otherside, I should say certain) that the influence of the Indian Mahomedans may at any rate avail to keep the Sultan in Constantinople. But I doubt whether they will gain any advantage by doing so. For a Turkey cut down to the Turkish parts of Asia-Minor, Constantinople would be a very inconvenient capital. I think its inconvenience would more than outweigh the sentimental gratification of keeping up a phantom of the old Ottoman Empire. But if the Indian Mahomedans want the Sultan to retain his place in Constantinople, I think the assurances given officially by the Viceroy in India now binds us to insist on his remaining there and I think he will remain there, in spite of America."

This is an extract from the letter of an Englishman enjoying a position in Great Britain, to a friend in India. It is a typical letter, sober, honest, to the point and put in such graceful language that whilst it challenges you, it commands your respect by its very gracefulness. But it is just this attitude based upon insufficient or false information which has ruined many a cause in the British Isles. The superfi-

ality, the one-sidedness, the inaccuracy and often even dishonesty that have crept into modern journalism, continuously mislead honest men who want to see nothing but justice done. Then there are always interested groups whose business it is to serve their ends by means fair or foul. And the honest Englishman wishing to vote for justice but swayed by conflicting opinions and dominated by distorted versions, often ends by becoming an instrument of injustice.

The writer of the letter quoted above has built up convincing argument on imaginary data. He has successfully shown that the Mahomedan case, as it has been presented to him, is a rotten case. In India, where it is not quite easy to distort facts about the Khilafat, English friends admit the utter justice of the Indian Mahomedan claim. But they plead helplessness and tell us that the Government of India and Mr. Montagu have done all it was humanly possible for them to do. And if now the judgment goes against Islam, Indian Mahomedans should resign themselves to it. This extraordinary state of things would not be possible except under this modern rush and preoccupations of all responsible people.

Let us for a moment examine the case as it has been imagined by the writer. He suggests that Indian Mahomedans want Turkish rule in Arabia in spite of the opposition of the Arabs themselves and that if the Arabs do not want Turkish rule, the writer argues, no false religious sentiment can be permitted to interfere with self-determination of the Arabs when India herself has been pleading for that very status. Now the fact is that the Mahomedans, as is known to everybody who has at

all studied the case, have never asked for Turkish rule in Arabia in opposition to the Arabs. On the contrary, they have said that they have no intention of resisting Arabian self-government. All they ask for is Turkish suzerainty over Arabia which would guarantee complete self-rule for the Arabs. They want Khalif's control of the Holy Places of Islam. In other words they ask for nothing more than what was guaranteed by Mr. Lloyd George and on the strength of which guarantee Mahomedan soldiers spilt their blood on behalf of the Allied Powers. All the elaborate arguments therefore and the cogent reasoning of the above extract fall to pieces based as they are upon a case that has never existed. I have thrown myself heart and soul into this question because British pledges, abstract justice, and religious sentiment coincide. I can conceive the possibility of a blind and fanatical religious sentiment existing in opposition to pure justice. I should then resist the former and fight for the latter. Nor would I insist upon pledges given dishonestly to support an unjust cause as has happened with England in the case of the secret treaties. Resistance there becomes not only lawful but obligatory on the part of a nation that prides itself on its righteousness.

It is unnecessary for me to examine the position imagined by the English friend *viz.*, how India would have fared had she been an independent power. It is unnecessary because Indian Mahomedans, and for that matter India, are fighting for a cause that is admittedly just; a cause in aid of which they are invoking the whole-hearted support of the British people. I would however venture to suggest that this is a cause in which mere sympathy will

not suffice. It is a cause which demands support that is strong enough to bring about substantial justice.

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 19, 1930.)

“I write to thank you for yours of the 7th inst. and especially for your request that I should, after reading your writings in *Young India* on non-co-operation, give a full and frank criticism of them. I know that your sole desire is to find out the truth and to act accordingly, and hence I venture to make the following remarks. In the issue of May 5th you say that non-co-operation is ‘not even anti-Government.’ But surely to refuse to have anything to do with the Government to the extent of not serving it and of not paying its taxes is actually, if not theoretically, anti-Government; and such a course must ultimately make all Government impossible. Again, you say, ‘It is the inherent right of a subject to refuse to assist a Government that will not listen to him.’ Leaving aside the question of the ethical soundness of this proposition, may I ask which Government, in the present case? Has not the Indian Government done all it possibly can in the matter? Then if its attempts to voice the request of India should fail, would it be fair and just to do anything against it? Would not the proper course be non-co-operation with the Supreme Council of the Allies, including Great Britain, if it be found that the latter has failed properly to support the demand of the Indian Government and

people ? It seems to me that in all your writings and speeches you forget that in the present question both Government and people are at one, and if they fail to get what they justly want, how does the question of non-co-operation arise ? Hindus and Englishmen and the Government *are all at present* 'shouldering in a full-hearted manner the burden the Mahomedans of India are carrying etc. etc.' But supposing we fail of our object—what then ? Are *we all* to refuse to co-operate and with whom ?

Might I recommend the consideration of the following course of conduct :

(1) 'Wait and see' what the actual terms of the Treaty with Turkey are.

(2) If they are not in accordance with the aspirations and recommendations of the Government and the people of India, then every legitimate effort should be made to have the terms revised.

(3) To the bitter end, co-operate with a Government that co-operates with us, and only when it refuses co-operation, go in for non-co-operation.

So far I personally see no reason whatsoever for non-co-operation with the Indian Government, and till it fails to voice the needs and demands of India as a whole there can be no reason. The Indian Government does sometimes make mistakes, but in the Khilafat matter it is sound and therefore deserves or ought to have the sympathetic and whole-hearted co-operation of every one in India. I hope that you will kindly consider the above and perhaps you will be able to find time for a reply in *Young India*."

I gladly make room for the above letter and respond to the suggestion to give a public reply as no

doubt the difficulty experienced by the English friend is experienced by many. Causes are generally lost, not owing to the determined opposition of men who will not see the truth as they want to perpetuate an injustice but because they are able to enlist in their favour the allegiance of those who are anxious to understand a particular cause and take sides after mature judgment. It is only by patient argument with such honest men that one is able to check oneself, correct one's own errors of judgment and at times to wean them from their error and bring them over to one's side. This Khilafat question is specially difficult because there are so many side issues. It is therefore no wonder that many have more or less difficulty in making up their minds. It is further complicated because the painful necessity for some direct action has arisen in connection with it. But whatever the difficulty, I am convinced that there is no question so important as this one if we want harmony and peace in India.

My friend objects to my statement that non-co-operation is not anti-Government, because he considers that refusal to serve it and pay its taxes is actually anti-Government. I respectfully dissent from the view. If a brother has fundamental differences with his brother, and association with the latter involves his partaking of what in his opinion is an injustice, I hold that it is his brotherly duty to refrain from serving his brother and sharing his earnings with him. This happens in everyday life. Prahlad did not act against his father, when he declined to associate himself with the latter's blasphemies. Nor was Jesus anti-Jewish when he declaimed against the

Pharisees and the hypocrites, and would have none of them. In such matters, is it not the intention that determines the character of a particular act? It is hardly correct as the friend suggests that withdrawal of association under general circumstances would make all government impossible. But it is true that such withdrawal would make all injustice impossible.

My correspondent considers that the Government of India having done all it possibly could, non-cooperation could not be applicable to that Government. In my opinion, whilst it is true that the Government of India has done a great deal, it has not done half as much as it might have done, and might even now do. No Government can absolve itself from further action beyond protesting, when it realises that the people whom it represents feel as keenly as do lakhs of Indian Mussalmans in the Khilafat question. No amount of sympathy with a starving man can possibly avail. He must have bread or he dies, and what is wanted at that critical moment is some exertion to fetch the wherewithal to feed the dying man. The Government of India can to-day head the agitation and ask, to the point of insistence, for full vindication of the pledged word of a British Minister. Has the Government of India resigned by way of protest against the threatened, shameful betrayal of trust on the part of Mr. Lloyd George? Why does the Government of India hide itself behind secret despatches? At a less critical moment Lord Hardinge committed a constitutional indiscretion, openly sympathised with the South African Passive Resistance movement and stemmed the surging

tide of public indignation in India, though at the same time he incurred the wrath of the then South African Cabinet and some public men in Great Britain. After all, the utmost that the Government of India has done is on its own showing to transmit and press the Mahomedan claim. Was that not the least it could have done? Could it have done anything less without covering itself with disgrace? What Indian Mahomedans and the Indian public expect the Government of India to do at this critical juncture is not the least, but the utmost that it could do. Viceroy's have been known to tender resignations for much smaller causes. Wounded pride brought forth not very long ago the resignation of a Lieutenant-Governor. On the Khilafat question, a sacred cause, dear to the hearts of several million Mahomedans, is in danger of being wounded. I would therefore invite the English friend, and every Englishman in India, and every Hindu, be he moderate or extremist, to make common cause with the Mahomedans and thereby compel the Government of India to do its duty, and thereby compel His Majesty's Ministers to do theirs.

There has been much talk of violence ensuing from active non-co-operation. I venture to suggest that the Mussalmans of India, if they had nothing in the shape of non-co-operation in view, would have long ago yielded to counsels of despair. I admit that non-co-operation is ~~not~~ unattended with danger. But violence is a certainty without, violence is only a possibility with, non-co-operation. And it will be a greater possibility if all the important men, English, Hindu and others of the country discountenance it.

I think that the recommendation made by the friend is being literally followed by the Mahomedans. Although they practically know the fate, they are waiting for the actual terms of the treaty with Turkey. They are certainly going to try every means at their disposal to have the terms revised before beginning non-co-operation. And there will certainly be no non-co-operation commenced so long as there is even hope of active co-operation on the part of the Government of India with the Mahomedans, that is, co-operation strong enough to secure a revision of the terms should they be found to be in conflict with the pledges of British statesmen. But if all these things fail, can Mahomedans as men of honour who hold their religion dearer than their lives do anything less than wash their hands clean of the guilt of British Ministers and the Government of India by refusing to co-operate with them? And can Hindus and Englishmen, if they value Mahomedan friendship, and if they admit the full justice of the Mahomedan claim, do otherwise than heartily support the Mahomedans by word and deed?

FURTHER QUESTIONS ANSWERED

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 2, 1920.*)

I have been overwhelmed with public criticism and private advice and even anonymous letters telling me exactly what I should do. Some are impatient that I do advise immediate and extensive non-co-operation ; others

tell me what harm I am doing the country by throwing it knowingly in a tempest of violence on either side. It is difficult for me to deal with the whole of the criticism, but I would summarise some of the objections and endeavour to answer them to the best of my ability. These are in addition to those I have already answered:—

(1) Turkish claim is immoral or unjust and how can I, a lover of truth and justice, support it ?

(2) Even if the claim be just in theory, the Turk is hopelessly incapable, weak and cruel. He does not deserve any assistance.

(3) Even if Turkey deserves all that is claimed for her, why should I land India in an international struggle ?

(4) It is no part of the Indian Mahomedans' business to meddle in this affair. If they cherish any political ambition, they have tried, they have failed and they should now sit still. If it is a religious matter with them, it cannot appeal to the Hindu reason in the manner it is put, and in any case Hindus ought not to identify themselves with Mahomedans in their religious quarrel with Christendom.

(5) In no case should I advocate non-co-operation which in its extreme sense is nothing but a rebellion, no matter how peaceful it may be.

(6) Moreover, my experience of last year must show me that it is beyond the capacity of any single human being to control the forces of violence that are lying dormant in the land.

(7) Non-co-operation is futile because people will never respond in right earnest, and reaction that might

afterwards set in will be worse than the state of hopefulness we are now in.

(8) Non-co-operation will bring about cessation of all other activities, even working of the Reforms, and thus set back the clock of progress.

(9) However pure my motives may be, those of the Mussalmans are obviously revengeful.

I shall now answer the objections in the order in which they are stated.

(1) In my opinion the Turkish claim is not only not immoral and unjust, but it is highly equitable, if only because Turkey wants to retain what is her own. And the Mahomedan manifesto has definitely declared that whatever guarantees may be necessary to be taken for the protection of non-Muslim and non-Turkish races, should be taken so as to give the Christians theirs and the Arabs their self-government under the Turkish suzerainty.

(2) I do not believe the Turk to be weak, incapable or cruel. He is certainly disorganised and probably without good generalship. He has been obliged to fight against heavy odds. The argument of weakness, incapacity and cruelty one often hears quoted in connection with those from whom power is sought to be taken away. About the alleged massacres a proper commission has been asked for, but never granted. And in any case security can be taken against oppression.

(3) I have already stated that if I were not interested in the Indian Mahomedans, I would not interest myself in the welfare of the Turks any more than I am in that of the Austrians or the Poles. But I am bound as an Indian

to share the sufferings and trials of fellow-Indians. If I deem the Mahomedan to be my brother, it is my duty to help him in his hour of peril to the best of my ability, if his cause commends itself to me as just.

(4) The fourth refers to the extent Hindus should join hands with the Mahomedans. It is therefore a matter of feeling and opinion. It is expedient to suffer for my Mahomedan brother to the utmost in a just cause and I should therefore travel with him along the whole road so long as the means employed by him are as honourable as his end. I cannot regulate the Mahomedan feeling. I must accept his statement that the Khilafat is with him a religious question in the sense that it binds him to reach the goal even at the cost of his own life.

(5) I do not consider non-co-operation to be a rebellion, because, it is free from violence. In a larger sense all opposition to a Government measure is a rebellion. In that sense, rebellion in a just cause is a duty, the extent of opposition being determined by the measure of the injustice done and felt.

(6) My experience of last year shows me that in spite of aberrations in some parts of India, the country was entirely under control, that the influence of Satyagraha was profoundly for its good and that where violence did break out there were local causes that directly contributed to it. At the same time I admit that even the violence that did take place on the part of the people and the spirit of lawlessness that was undoubtedly shown in some parts should have remained under check. I have made ample acknowledgment of the miscalculation I then made. But all the painful experience that I then gained did not in

any way shake my belief in Satyagraha or in the possibility of that matchless force being utilised in India. Ample provision is being made this time to avoid the mistakes of the past. But I must refuse to be deterred from a clear course because it may be attended by violence totally unintended and in spite of extraordinary efforts that are being made to prevent it. At the same time I must make my position clear. Nothing can possibly prevent a Satyagrahi from doing his duty because of the frown of the authorities. I would risk, if necessary, a million lives so long as they are voluntary sufferers and are innocent, spotless victims. It is the mistakes of the people that matter in a Satyagraha campaign. Mistakes, even insanity, must be expected from the strong and the powerful, and the moment of victory has come when there is no retort to the mad fury of the powerful but a voluntary, dignified and quiet submission—but not submission to the will of the authority that has put itself in the wrong. The secret of success lies therefore in holding every English life and the life of every officer serving the Government as sacred as those of our own dear ones. All the wonderful experience I have gained now during nearly 40 years of conscious existence, has convinced me that there is no gift so precious as that of life. I make bold to say that the moment the Englishmen feel that although they are in India in a hopeless minority, their lives are protected against harm not because of the matchless weapons of destruction which are at their disposal, but because Indians refuse to take the lives even of those whom they may consider to be utterly in the wrong—that moment will see a transformation

in the English nature in its relation to India, and that moment will also be the moment when all the destructive cutlery that is to be had in India will begin to rust. I know that this is a far-off vision. That cannot matter to me. It is enough for me to see the light and to act up to it, and it is more than enough when I gain companions in the onward march, I have claimed in private conversations with English friends that it is because of my incessant preaching of the gospel of non-violence and my having successfully demonstrated its practical utility that so far the forces of violence, which are undoubtedly in existence in connection with the Khilafat movement, have remained under complete control.

(7) From a religious stand-point the seventh objection is hardly worth considering. If people do not respond to the movement of non-co-operation, it would be a pity, but that can be no reason for a reformer not to try. It would be to me a demonstration that the present position of hopefulness is not dependent on any inward strength or knowledge, but it is hope born of ignorance and superstition.

(8) If non-co-operation is taken up in earnest, it must bring about a cessation of all other activities including the Reforms, but I decline to draw therefore the corollary that it will set back the clock of progress. On the contrary, I consider non-co-operation to be such a powerful and pure instrument that if it is enforced in an earnest spirit, it will be like seeking first the Kingdom of God and everything else following as a matter of course. People will have then realised their true power. They would

have learnt the value of discipline, self-control, joint action, non-violence, organisation and everything else that goes to make a nation great and good, and not merely great.

(9) I do not know that I have a right to arrogate greater purity for myself than for our Mussalman brethren. But I do admit that they do not believe in my doctrine of non-violence to the full extent. For them it is a weapon of the weak, an expedient. They consider non-co-operation without violence to be the only thing open to them in the war of direct action. I know that if some of them could offer successful violence, they would do to-day. But they are convinced that humanly speaking it is an impossibility. For them, therefore, non-co-operation is a matter not merely of duty but also of revenge. Whereas I take up non-co-operation against the Government as I have actually taken it up in practice against members of my own family, I entertain very high regard for the British constitution. I have not only no enmity against Englishmen but I regard much in English character as worthy of my emulation. I count many as my friends. It is against my religion to regard any one as an enemy. I entertain similar sentiments with respect to Mahomedans. I find their cause to be just and pure. Although therefore their view-point is different from mine I do not hesitate to associate with them and invite them to give my method a trial, for, I believe that the use of a pure weapon even from a mistaken motive does not fail to produce some good, even as the telling of truth, if only because for the time being it is the best policy, is at least so much to the good.

MR. CANDLER'S OPEN LETTER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*May 26, 1920.*)

Mr. Candler has favoured me with an open letter on this question of questions. The letter has already appeared in the Press. I can appreciate Mr. Candler's position as I would like him and other Englishmen to appreciate mine and that of hundreds of Hindus who feel as I do. Mr. Candler's letter is an attempt to show that Mr. Lloyd George's pledge is not in any way broken by the peace terms. I quite agree with him that Mr. Lloyd George's words ought not to be torn from their context to support the Mahomedan claim. These are Mr. Lloyd George's words as quoted in the recent Viceregal message: "Nor are we fighting to destroy Austria-Hungary or to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race." Mr. Candler seems to read 'which' as if it meant 'if they,' whereas I give the pronoun its natural meaning, namely, that the Prime Minister knew in 1918, that the lands referred to by him were 'predominantly Turkish in race.' And if this is the meaning, I venture to suggest that the pledge has been broken in a most barefaced manner, for there is practically nothing left to the Turk of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace.'

I have already given my view of the retention of the Sultan in Constantinople. It is an insult to the intelligence of man to suggest that the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the home-land of the Turkish race

with its capital at Constantinople' has been left unimpaired by the terms of peace. This is the other passage from the speech which I presume Mr. Candler wants me to read together with the one already quoted :—

“ While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the home-land of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea being internationalised, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine are in our judgment entitled to a recognition of their separate national condition.”

Did that mean entire removal of Turkish influence, extinction of Turkish suzerainty and the introduction of European-Christian influence under the guise of Mandates? Have the Moslems of Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine been committed, or is the new arrangement being superimposed upon them by Powers conscious of their own own brute-strength rather than of justice of their action? I for one, would nurse by every legitimate means the spirit of independence in the brave Arabs, but I shudder to think what will happen to them under the schemes of exploitation of their country by the greedy capitalists protected as they will be by the mandatory Powers. If the pledge is to be fulfilled, let these places have full self-government with suzerainty to be retained with Turkey as has been suggested by the *Times of India*. Let there be all the necessary guarantees taken from Turkey about the internal independence of the Arabs. But to remove that suzerainty, to deprive the Khalif of the wardenship of the Holy places is to render Khilafat a mockery which no Mahomedan can possibly

look upon with equanimity. I am not alone in my interpretation of the pledge. The Right Hon'ble Ameer Ali calls the peace terms a breach of faith. Mr. Charles Roberts reminds the British public that the Indian Mussalman sentiment regarding the Turkish Treaty is based upon the Prime Minister's pledge "regarding Thrace, Constantinople and Turkish lands in Asia Minor, repeated on Feb. 26 last with deliberation by Mr. Lloyd George." Mr. Roberts holds that the pledge must be treated as a whole, not as binding only regarding Constantinople but also binding as regards Thrace and Asia Minor. He describes the pledge as binding upon the nation as a whole and its breach in any part as a gross breach of faith on the part of the British Empire. He demands that, if there is an unanswerable reply to the charge of breach of faith, it ought to be given and adds the Prime Minister may regard his own word lightly if he chooses, but he has no right to break a pledge given on behalf of the nation. He concludes that it is incredible that such pledge should not have been kept in the letter and in the spirit. He adds: "I have reason to believe that these views are fully shared by prominent members of the Cabinet."

I wonder if Mr. Candler knows what is going on to-day in England. Mr. Pickthall writing in *New Age* says: "No impartial international enquiry into the whole question of the Armenian massacres has been instituted in the ample time which has elapsed since the conclusion of armistice with Turkey. The Turkish Government has asked for such enquiry. But the Armenian organisations and the Armenian partisans refuse to hear of such a thing,

declaring that the Bryce and Lepssens reports are quite sufficient to condemn the Turks. In other words the judgment should be given on the case for prosecution alone. The inter-allied commission which investigated the unfortunate events in Smyrna last year, made a report unfavourable to Greek claims. Therefore, that report has not been published here in England, though in other countries it has long been public property." He then goes on to show how money is being scattered by Armenian and Greek emissaries in order to popularise their cause and adds: "This conjunction of dense ignorance and cunning falsehood is fraught with instant danger to the British realm", and concludes: "A Government and people which prefer propaganda to fact as the ground of policy—and foreign policy at that—is self-condemned."

I have reproduced the above extract in order to show that the present British policy has been affected by propaganda of an unscrupulous nature. Turkey which was dominant over two million square miles of Asia, Africa and Europe in the 17th century, under the terms of the treaty, says the *London Chronicle*, has dwindled down to little more than 1,000 square miles. It says, "All European Turkey could now be accommodated comfortably between the Landsend and the Tamar, Cornwall alone exceeding its total area, and but for its alliance with Germany, Turkey could have been assured of retaining at least sixty thousand square miles of the Eastern Balkans." I do not know whether the *Chronicle*'s view is generally shared. Is it by way of punishment that Turkey is to undergo such shrinkage, or is it because justice demands

it? If Turkey had not made the mistake of joining Germany, would the principle of nationality have been still applied to Armenia, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Palestine?

Let me now remind those who think with Mr. Candler that the promise was not made by Mr. Lloyd George to the people of India in anticipation of the supply of recruits continuing. In defending his own statement, Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have said :

"The effect of the statement in India was that recruiting went up appreciably from that very moment. They were not all Mahomedans but there were many Mahomedans amongst them: Now we are told that was an offer to Turkey. But they rejected it, and therefore we were absolutely free. It was not. It is too often forgotten that we are the greatest Mahomedan power in the world and that one-fourth of the population of the British Empire is Mahomedan. There have been no more loyal adherents to the throne and no more effective and loyal supporters of the Empire in its hour of trial. *We gave a solemn pledge and they accepted it.* They are disturbed by the prospect of our not abiding by it."

Who shall interpret that pledge and how? How did the Government of India itself interpret it? Did it or did it not energetically support the claim for the control of the Holy Places of Islam vesting in the Khalif? Did the Government of India suggest that the whole of Jazirat-ul-Arab could be taken away consistently with that pledge from the sphere of influence of the Khalif, and given over to the Allies as mandatory Powers? Why does the Government of India sympathise with the Indian Mussalmans

if the terms are all they should be? So much for the pledge. I would like to guard myself against being understood that I stand or fall absolutely by Mr. Lloyd George's declaration. I have advisedly used the adverb 'practically' in connection with it. It is an important qualification.

Mr. Candler seems to suggest that my goal is something more than merely attaining justice on the Khilafat. If so, he is right. Attainment of justice is undoubtedly the corner-stone, and if I found that I was wrong in my conception of justice on this question, I hope I shall have the courage immediately to retrace my steps. But by helping the Mahomedans of India at a critical moment in their history, I want to buy their friendship. Moreover, if I can carry the Mahomedans with me I hope to wean Great Britain from the downward path along which the Prime Minister seems to me to be taking her. I hope also to show to India and the Empire at large that given a certain amount of capacity for self-sacrifice, justice can be secured by peace fullest and cleanest means without showing or increasing bitterness between English and Indians. For, whatever may be the temporary effect of my methods, I know enough of them to feel certain that they alone are immune from lasting bitterness.

APPEAL TO THE VICEROY

(June 30, 1920).

Your Excellency.

As one who has enjoyed a certain measure of your Excellency's confidence, and as one who claims to be a

devoted well-wisher of the British Empire, I owe it to your Excellency, and through your Excellency to His Majesty's Ministers, to explain my connection with and my conduct in the Khilafat question.

At the very earliest stage of the war, even whilst I was in London organising the Indian Volunteer Ambulance Corps, I began to interest myself in the Khilafat question. I perceived how deeply moved the little Mussalman world in London was when Turkey decided to throw in her lot with Germany. On my arrival in India in the January of 1915, I found the same anxiousness and earnestness among the Mussalmans with whom I came in contact. Their anxiety became intense when the information about the Secret Treaties leaked out. Distrust of British intentions filled their minds, and despair took possession of them. Even at that moment I advised my Mussalman friends not to give way to despair, but to express their fear and their hopes in a disciplined manner. It will be admitted that the whole of Mussalman India has behaved in a singularly restrained manner during the past five years, and that the leaders have been able to keep the turbulent sections of their community under complete control.

The peace terms and Your Excellency's defence of them have given the Mussalmans of India a shock from which it will be difficult for them to recover. The terms violate ministerial pledges and utterly disregard Mussalman sentiment. (I consider that as a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussalman countrymen, I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In

my humble opinion, their cause is just. They claim that Turkey must not be *punished* if their sentiment is to be respected. Muslim soldiers did not fight to inflict punishment on their own Khalifa or to deprive him of his territories. The Mussalman attitude has been consistent throughout these five years.

My duty to the Empire to which I owe my loyalty requires me to resist the cruel violence that has been done to the Mussalman sentiment. So far as I am aware, Mussalmans and Hindus have as a whole lost faith in British justice and honour. (The report of the Majority of the Hunter Committee, Your Excellency's despatch thereon and Mr. Montagu's reply have only aggravated the distrust.)

In these circumstances the only course open to one like me is either in despair to sever all connection with British rule, or, if I still retained faith in the inherent superiority of the British constitution to all others at present in vogue, to adopt such means as will rectify the wrong done, and thus restore confidence. I have not lost faith in such superiority and I am not without hope that somehow or other justice will yet be rendered if we show the requisite capacity for suffering. Indeed, my conception of that constitution is that it helps only those who are ready to help themselves. I do not believe that it protects the weak. It gives free scope to the strong to maintain their strength and develop it. The weak under it go to the wall.

It is, then, because I believe in the British constitution that I have advised my Mussalman friends to withdraw their support from your Excellency's Government, and the Hindus to join them, should the peace terms not be

revised in accordance with the solemn pledges of Ministers and the Muslim sentiment.

Three courses were open to the Mahomedans in order to mark their emphatic disapproval of the utter injustice to which His Majesty's Ministers have become party, if they have not actually been the prime perpetrators of it. They are :—

- (1) To resort to violence.
- (2) To advise emigration on a wholesale scale.
- (3) Not to be party to the injustice by ceasing to co-operate with the Government.

Your Excellency must be aware that there was a time when the boldest, though the most thoughtless, among the Mussalmans favoured violence, and the "Hijrat" (emigration) has not yet ceased to be the battle-cry. I venture to claim that I have succeeded by patient reasoning in weaning the party of violence from its ways. I confess that I did not—I did not attempt to succeed in weaning them from violence on moral grounds, but purely on utilitarian grounds. The result, for the time being at any rate, has, however, been to stop violence. The School of "Hijrat" has received a check, if it has not stopped its activity entirely. I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent eruption, if the people had not had presented to them a form of direct action involving considerable sacrifice and ensuring success if such direct action was largely taken up by the public. Non-co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. For it is the right recognised from times immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules.

At the same time I admit that non-co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. But in a crisis such as has overtaken the Mussalmans of India, no step that is unattended with large risks, can possibly bring about the desired change. Not to run some risks now will be to court much greater risks if not virtual destruction of Law and Order.

But there is yet an escape from non-co-operation. The Mussalman representation has requested Your Excellency to lead the agitation yourself, as did your distinguished predecessor at the time of the South African trouble. But if you cannot see your way to do so, and non-co-operation becomes a dire necessity, I hope that Your Excellency will give those who have accepted my advice and myself the credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty.

Laburnam Road,
Gamdevi, Bombay,
22nd June, 1920.

I have the honour to remain,
Your Excellency's faithful servant,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

HIJARAT AND ITS MEANING

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 21, 1920.)

India is a continent. Its articulate thousands know what its inarticulate millions are doing or thinking. The Government and the educated Indians may think that the Khilafat movement is merely a passing phase. The millions of Musulmans think otherwise. The flight of the Mussul-

mans is growing apace. The newspapers contain paragraphs in out of the way corners informing the readers that a special train containing a barrister with sixty women, forty children including twenty sucklings, all told 765, have left for Afghanistan. They were cheered *en route*. They were presented with cash, edibles and other things, and were joined by more Mahajarins on the way. No fanatical preaching by a Shaukat Ali can make people break up and leave their homes for an unknown land. There must be an abiding faith in them. That it is better for them to leave a State which has no regard for their religious sentiment and face a beggar's life than to remain in it even though it may be in a princely manner. Nothing but pride of power can blind the Government of India to the scene that is being enacted before it.

But there is yet another side to the movement. Here are the facts as stated in the following Government *Communiqué* dated 10th instant :—

An unfortunate affair in connection with the Mahajarin occurred on the 8th instant at Kacha Garhi between Peshawar and Jamrud. The following are the facts as at present reported. Two members of a party of the Mahajarins proceeding by train to Jamrud were detected by the British military police travelling without tickets. Altercation ensued at Islamia College Station, but the train proceeded to Kacha Garhi. An attempt was made to evict these Mahajarins, whereupon the military police were attacked by a crowd of some forty Mahajarins and the British officer who intervened was seriously wounded with a spade. A detachment of Indian troops at Kacha Garhi thereupon fired two or three shots at the

Mahajarin for making murderous assault on the British officer. One Mahajarin was killed and one wounded and three arrested. Both the military and the police were injured. The body of the Mahajarin was despatched to Peshawar and buried on the morning of the 9th. This incident has caused considerable excitement in Peshawar City, and the Khilafat Hijrat Committee are exercising restraining influence. Shops were closed on the morning of the 9th. A full enquiry has been instituted.

Now, Peshawar to Jamrud is a matter of a few miles. It was clearly the duty of the military not to attempt to pull out the ticketless Mahajarins for the sake of a few annas. But they actually attempted force. Intervention by the rest of the party was a forgone conclusion. An altercation ensued. A British officer was attacked with a spade. Firing and a death of Mahajarin was the result. Has British prestige been enhanced by the episode? Why have not the Government put tactful officers in charge at the frontier, whilst a great religious emigration is in progress? The action of the military will pass from tongue to tongue throughout India and the Mussalman world around, will no doubt be unconsciously and even consciously exaggerated in the passage and the feeling bitter as it already is will grow in bitterness. The *Communique* says that the Government are making further inquiry. Let us hope that it will be full and that better arrangements will be made to prevent a repetition of what appears to have been a thoughtless act on the part of the military.

And may I draw the attention of those who are opposing non-co-operation that unless they find out a

substitute they should either join the non-co-operation movement or prepare to face a disorganised subterranean upheaval whose effect no one can foresee and whose spread it would be impossible to check or regulate.

MR. ANDREWS' DIFFICULTY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 21, 1920.)

Mr. Andrews whose love for India is equalled only by his love for England and whose mission in life is to serve God *i. e.* humanity through India, has contributed remarkable articles to the *Bombay Chronicle* on the Khilafat movement. He has not spared England, France or Italy. He has shown how Turkey has been most unjustly dealt with and how the Prime Minister's pledge has been broken. He has devoted the last article to an examination of Mr. Mahomed Ali's letter to the Sultan and has come to the conclusion that Mr. Mahomed Ali's statement of claim is at variance with the claim set forth in the latest Khilafat representation to the Viceroy which he wholly approves.

Mr. Andrews and I have discussed the question as fully as it was possible. He has asked me publicly to define my own position more fully than I have done. His sole object in inviting discussion is to give strength to a cause which he holds as intrinsically just, and to gather round it the best opinion of Europe so that the allied powers and especially England may for very shame be obliged to revise the terms.

I gladly respond to Mr. Andrews' invitation. I should clear the ground by stating that I reject any religious doctrine that does not appeal to reason and is in conflict with morality. I tolerate unreasonable religious sentiment when it is not immoral. I hold the Khilafat claim to be both just and reasonable and therefore it derives greater force because it has behind it the religious sentiment of the Mussalman world.

In my opinion Mr. Mahomed Ali's statement is unexceptionable. It is no doubt clothed in diplomatic language. But I am not prepared to quarrel with the language so long as it is sound in substance.

Mr. Andrews considers that Mr. Mahomed Ali's language goes to show that he would resist Armenian independence against the Armenians and the Arabian against the Arabs. I attach no such meaning to it. What he, the whole Musulmans, and therefore, I think also, the Hindus, resist is the shameless attempt of England and the other Powers under cover of self-determination to emasculate and dismember Turkey. If I understand the spirit of Islam properly, it is essentially republican in the truest sense of the term. Therefore if Armenia or Arabia desired independence of Turkey, they should have it. In the case of Arabia complete Arabian independence would mean transference of the Khilafat to an Arab Chieftain. Arabia in that sense is a Musulman trust, not purely Arabian. And the Arabs without ceasing to be Musulman, could not hold Arabia against Muslim opinion. The Khalifa must be the custodian of the holy places and therefore also the routes to them. He must be able to defend them against the whole world. And if an Arab

chief arose who could better satisfy that test than the Sultan of Turkey, I have no doubt that he would be recognised as the Khalifat.

It is common knowledge that Smyrna and Thrace including Adrianople have been dishonestly taken away from Turkey and that mandates have been unscrupulously established in Syria and Mesopotamia and a British nominee has been set up in Hedjaz under the protection of British guns. This is a position that is intolerable and unjust. Apart therefore from the questions of Armenia and Arabia, the dishonesty and hypocrisy that pollute the peace terms require to be instantaneously removed. It paves the way to an equitable solution of the question of Armenian and Arabian independence which in theory no one denies and which in practice may be easily guaranteed if only the wishes of the people concerned could with any degree of certainty be ascertained.

THE TURKISH QUESTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 29, 1921.*)

If we mean really well by our Mussalman brethren, we must sympathize with them over the movement going on in Europe to destroy Turkish nationalism. It is a thousand pities, that the British Government is secretly or openly leading the movement. Let Hindus not be frightened by Pan-Islamism. It is not—it need not be—anti-Indian or anti-Hindu. Mussalmans must wish well to every Mussalman state, and even assist any such state, if it is un-

deservedly in peril. And Hindus, if they are true friends of Mussalmans, cannot but share the latter's feelings. We must therefore co-operate with our Mussalman brethren in their attempt to save the Turkish empire in Europe from extinction.

Hindus may not then be agitated, when Mussalmans become alarmed at the slightest hint that the British Government might openly join the Greeks against the Turkish Government in Angora. If Britain should go so mad, India cannot possibly help the British Government in any such design upon Turkey. It would be tantamount to a war with Islam.

England has her choice. She can no longer hold the awakened Hindus and Mussalmans as slaves. If India is to remain equal partner with every other member of the Empire, India's voting strength must be infinitely superior to that of any other member. In a free commonwealth, every partner has as much right to retire, if the rest go wrong, as it is his duty to remain so long as the rest are faithful to certain common principles. If India votes wrong, England can retire from partnership, as every other partner can. Thus, the centre of equilibrium must shift to India rather than remain in England, when India has come into her own. That is my meaning of Swaraj within the Empire. Brute force must be ruled out of account in all deliberations. Reference must be had always to reason and never to the sword.

And as with England, so with India. The latter, too, has her choice. To-day, we are striving for Swaraj within the Empire in the hope that England will in the end prove true, and for independence if she fails. But when

it is incontestably proved that Britain seeks to destroy Turkey, India's only choice must be independence. For Mussalmans, when Turkey's existence, such as it is, is threatened, there is no looking back. They would draw the sword if they could, and perish or rise victorious with the brave Turks. But if, as is certain, thanks to the policy of the Government of India, they cannot declare war against the British Government, they can at least forswear allegiance to a government which wickedly goes to war against Turkey. The duty of the Hindus is no less clear. If we still fear and distrust the Mussalmans, we must side with the British and prolong our slavery. If we are brave and religious enough not to fear the Mussalmans, our countrymen, and if we have the wisdom to trust them, we must make common cause with the Mussalmans in every peaceful and truthful method to secure Indian independence. For a Hindu, as I conceive Hinduism to be, whether for independence or for Swaraj within the Empire, there is no road but non-violent non-co-operation. India can have dominion or independent status to-day, if India learns and assimilates the secret and the invincible power of non-violence. When she has learnt that lesson, she is ready to take up all the stages of non-co-operation including non-payment of taxes. India is not ready to-day, but if we would be prepared to frustrate every plot that may be hatched for the destruction of Turkey or for prolonging our subjection, we must secure an atmosphere of enlightened non-violence as fast as possible, not the non-violence of the weak but the non-violence of the strong, who would disdain to kill but would gladly die for the vindication of truth.

THE MEANING OF THE KHILAFAT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*September 3, 1921.*)

I continue to receive letters from far and near, warning me against my interest in the Khilafat. Here is a typical letter from an old friend from New Zealand :—

“ Just a few lines to say I do not forget you. Were I in danger of so doing, the cables that often appear in our papers would prevent me forgetting. I see, you have a mighty problem you are trying to solve in regard to India. Whether you are facing it in the wisest way I cannot say, for I am not in a position to judge. I would esteem it a favour, if you would hand enclosed post office order for 10/- to the publisher of your paper, *Young India* I think it is called, if it is published in English, or to the publisher of any paper in English representing your side of the case. Perhaps as an old friend, I may be borne with if I speak freely, even although I should be speaking without full knowledge. It always grieved me, that you should be an arch-supporter of the Turkish Empire, and that the Khilafat question should be turned to political ends to undermine and cripple and confuse the administration of British Government in India. Turkey's crimes against Bulgarians, Greeks and Armenians call to heaven for judgment. I wonder, how far the Moslems in their All-India Khilafat Congress during recent years protested against those atrocities and dissociated themselves from the Turkish policy of extermination of a noble, excellent, industrious and gentle race (the Armenians). The

blood of these martyrs will cry to heaven for justice, and not one can be forgotten by Him who marks the sparrow's fall. If Turkey's history has been one of rapine and massacre, is it not therefore to be shorn of its power as no longer worthy to be trusted with it? If political power is not to be used to maintain justice, freedom and fraternity of tributary races, but is to be used for oppression, persecution, extermination, robbery and rapine, is such a nation not to be judged by other powers and deprived of her power to continue a malevolent sway? To be shorn of political power need not deprive Islam of its spiritual weapons if it has such. By its spiritual force let it live, or die if it has not such. Political power is a curse to any religion, and history shows, it has often been used tyrannically, e. g. the Roman Catholic Church.

I do not know what are exactly the aims of the non-co-operators, but it would appear they have come to object *in toto* to any British officials in the country. Rome was not built in a day, and a constitution cannot be framed ahead of the conditions of a country. Suppose all British officials were to leave bag and baggage to-morrow and Natives put in their place, would the administration be as pure as it is, would justice be done everywhere through the courts of your great country? I understand that the Indians fear the native police, and their officials (natives) are peculiarly open to bribery and corruption. Before a people can be self-governing, there must be a basis of national *character* on which to build and with which to build, and has the day come, when there are forces running through your various spheres of

social, educational and political life that are regenerative and purifying ?

Political propaganda, if revolutionary, may easily attract the basest and most malevolent among men, and if they capture the control of machinery of organisation, the blind and more than blind will lead those who follow their dictum to the pit. I am sure that you personally have not departed from your noble ideals and unselfish spirit of patriotism and justice, and freedom of soul, but there may be great slumbering forces awakened in the state of society around you, that may carry you far beyond the points of wisdom and measures that make for true national well-being. Your country has all the elements that might make India a Russia, a Sinn Fein Ireland, a land of civil war, inter-tribal bloodshed. Division may easily spread through a land like India, your independent princes may become arrayed on opposing sides, and no strong controlling unifying power be forthcoming to preserve peace, conserve progress, lead the way to *fuller* national life. Your pathway must be surrounded by snares and pitfalls which you can only escape by a clear vision of the will of God, and unfaltering adherence thereto. As long as you coincide with the wishes of the popular clamour, there will be many who will cry 'Hosanna' and will strew your path with palm leaves, but if you adhere to the high principles of the vision of God, the same people will cry, 'crucify him, away with him.' You know the parallel. He unfalteringly followed the will of God and they rejected Him. His aims were too pure, His Kingdom too spiritual, His methods too divine, He died, but God raised Him up and made that resurrec-

tion the life of the world's thought, made Him meet the need of all the men as Saviour, High Priest to represent, King to rule over.

Courage, brother ; do not stumble,
Though thy path be dark as night ;
There's a star to guide the humble :
Trust in God and do the right.
Let the road be rough and dreary
And its end far out of sight,
Foot it bravely, strong or weary,
Trust in God, and do the right.
Perish policy and cunning,
Perish all that fears the light !
Whether losing, whether winning,
Trust in God, and do the right,
Trust no party, sect or faction,
Trust no leaders in the fight ;
But in every word and action
Trust in God and do the right.
Trust no lovely forms of passion,—
Fiends may look like angels bright ;
Trust no custom, school or fashion ;
Trust in God and do the right.
Some will hate thee, some will love thee,
Some will flatter, some will slight ;
Cease from man and look above thee,
Trust in God and do the right.
Simple rule, and safest guiding,
Inward peace, and inward might,
Star upon our path abiding,—
Trust in God, and do the right.

Courage, brother, do not stumble,
 Though thy path be dark as night ;
 There's a star to guide the humble,
 Trust in God, and do the right.

The great thing is to have Divine wisdom, the deep insight into principles and the far-seeing wisdom of true statesmanship. You are doubtless familiar with the life of Abraham Lincoln, his clear-sighted vision, his absolute integrity, tender-heartedness, humility, humour, humane-ness.

I often say to my friends, ' If you heard Mr. Gandhi's side and the great grievances that exist under the present order of things, you would understand his opposition. '

The question is, what is the best way for the welfare of India to correct existing abuses. Strikes, violence arouse passions, and a hundred discontents and ill-feeling, and in most cases defeat their own ends. Reforms must come along constitutional lines, if the gain is to be accompanied by good feeling and unity and peace. Gains by revolutionary means cannot be a natural evolution. From my distant corner I can only earnestly pray, that God may guide and direct and bless you, and make you an instrument for the true well-being of India."

The warmth and the sincerity are unmistakable. I know the friend to be a devout God-fearing Christian. But it must be evident to any one who knows anything about the Turkish question, that my correspondent is strongly prejudiced against the Turks. His pictures of the Armenians as ' a noble, excellent, industrious and gentle race ' betrays the extent of his ignorance about the question. He cannot be blamed for it. The Turkish

side has been sedulously kept from the English-reading public. All these good Christians scattered about in different parts of the world have only one class of reading presented to them. The missionary journals are fanatically, I was going to say, criminally, anti-Turkish and anti-Islam. The very word charity about which St. Paul wrote so magnificently is absent from the minds of the writers in the missionary journals, when they write about Islam and Turkey. The Turk is to them the arch-infidel created by God only to be cursed. It is this prejudiced but honest attitude that stands in the way of Truth and Justice.

I have no desire to defend Turkey against the Armenians or the Greeks. I am not prepared to deny Turkish misrule or misdeeds. But the Greeks and the Armenians have an infinitely worse record. What is more, the defence of the Khilafat is the defence of a pure ideal. It is not necessary to defend the conduct of individual Popes in order to support the institution of Papacy. Oppose all Turkish misrule by all means but it is wicked to seek to efface the Turk and with him Islam from Europe under the false plea of Turkish misrule.

What is still worse is that the defeat of the Central Powers should be utilised to crush Islam. Was the late war a crusade against Islam, in which the Mussalmans of India were invited to join? To say that the Mussalmans may have anyone they choose as their spiritual head, but that they may not interfere with the disintegration of Turkey, is not to know the Khilafat. The Khalifa must ever be the Defender of the Faith of the Prophet, and therefore nobody can become or remain Khalifa immediate-

ly he is deprived of or loses the power of defending Islam against the whole world. One may dispute the ethics of the doctrine in the abstract, but England is not engaged in a war against Islam because it is unethical. In that case England has to renounce her association with millions whose faith is divorced from ethics.

As a matter of fact is there anything immoral in a religion seeking to sustain itself by possession of temporal power? In practice has not Christianity been sustained by temporal power? And even in Hinduism, have not Rajput Kings been custodians of Hinduism?

What I venture to commend to the many Christians who honestly think like my friend, is to join the defence of the Khilafat as an ideal, and thus recognise that the struggle of non-co-operation is one of religion against irreligion.

For my part I have the clearest possible conscience in this matter. The end to me is just. I fight to bolster up no fraud or injustice. The means are equally just. In the prosecution of the fight, truth and non-violence are the only weapons. Self-suffering is the truest test of sincerity.

THE KHILAFAT QUESTION

(December 3, 1919.)

The Khilafat Conference has told. The earnestness and the seriousness of purpose of the Moslems have been recognised, and also partly, if not fully, the justice of the cause, by those who till now refused to do so, or were looking at the matter with more or less indifference. The series of articles on the question in the *Times of India*,

which may be said to represent the thinking section of the Anglo-Indian Press and the Anglo-Indian public, are a striking testimony of the fact. They represent perhaps the first serious attempt in the Anglo-Indian Press—we hope to be excused for calling the formidable series an attempt—to tackle the Khilafat question, and though many of the objections advanced against the Turkish case are in no way new, and are but repetitions of the war-time propaganda against Turkey, they require to be closely examined lest they should be assumed to be taken as unanswered. We take the objections first, and the primary considerations, which the writer of the articles says, go to the root of the matter, next. Boiled down, the objections come to :—

(1) It is not a fact that Turkey is more severely dealt with than any other enemy power in the matter of territorial redistribution, as is proved by the facts in regard to the Dual Empire of Austria-Hungary.

(2) The future of Turkey is a matter to be decided by Allied policy on broad lines of strategy, politics and nationality, and not on a ministerial statement.

(3) Reliance is placed only on the first half of what is known as the Premier's pledge ; and it is urged, "with not great display of logic that while the case of Turkey must be decided in accordance with the principles of nationality, those principles should be ignored in the case of Arabia. But how about Mr. Lloyd George's pledge not to restore Arabia to its former sovereignty ?"

(4) Turkish rule has had evil results everywhere.

To take the first objection. It will be noticed that the objection is not against the statement that Turkey is more

severely dealt with than any other enemy power in matters other than that of territorial redistribution or that Turkey is more severely dealt with than, say, Germany. The objection is that the advocates of the Turkish case do not recognise that Austria-Hungary has been "more severely truncated, than has ever been proposed with regard to Turkey." This is the language of the paper's special correspondent. The paper in its leading article goes into more details and adduces facts with which it wishes Mr. Gandhi had acquainted his hearers in the Khilafat Conference. What then are the facts? An Empire of over 50 millions and consisting roughly of 260,000 sq. miles is, it is said, completely dismembered and large tracts of territory allotted from it to different nations. Now for one thing, this comparison with Austria-Hungary ignores the vital fact that both Empires in their ethnic elements differ as widely as the poles. The Austro-Hungarian Empire is a most fantastic mosaic, with its eleven million Germans, ten million Magyars, eight million Czechs, four million Poles, two million Jews and as many million Servians, Rumanians, Croatians and others. The Ottoman Empire is a homogeneous, indivisible whole. In the small European territory which is still left under Turkish rule it is the Moslems who preponderate, and in Asiatic Turkey a very vast majority are Moslems and Turks. To break up this homogeneous whole is surely more iniquitous than to break up a fantastic mosaic. "Divide the Turkish Empire," it has been pointedly said, "break it as you will, each fragment will be your living enemy striving by all means for reunion with the rest."

But it is not possible to conceive the magnitude of the iniquity in the case of the dismemberment of Turkey, unless it is realised that whereas portions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire are parcelled out to nations more or less kindred in race and faith, *i.e.* on the basis of a plebiscitum, the partition of the Turkish Empire is to be between European Christian nations hungering for the dissevered limbs. And certainly if for Christians to be ruled by Muslims is an abomination from the Christian standpoint, it can be no less an abomination from a Muslim standpoint, for Muslims to be ruled by Christians. And lastly even if it is for a moment assumed that the Austro-Hungarian Empire has suffered a greater iniquity, it will not, we suppose, be contended that one iniquity, justifies another.

(2) The second objection may be disposed of at once, as it is not very seriously pressed. As a matter of fact, it *cannot* be, in view of the attitude of America. Who, pray, are the Allies that now count? France and England. And the Moslem world has believed that Turkey's principal foe in the War has been England rather than France. The "lines of strategy, politics and nationality" feared by Turkey are those that may be followed by *England* if she still adheres to the war-time propaganda formulated on the advice of Tsarist Russia. And it is perfectly natural, therefore, that the Moslems should pin their faith to a Minister—Prime Minister—who solemnly gives an authoritative assurance that England has washed her hands off that pernicious propaganda.

(3) And this brings us to the now famous pledge. The

two parts of the pledge as quoted by the *Times of India* correspondent do not, to us, appear to be conflicting with each other. Both are included under the twelfth point of President Wilson, which lays down that :—"The Turkey's portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardenelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees."

This point which fully covers the Prime Minister's pledge has been as completely relied on by the Moslem world, as the pledge itself, if not more, and it cannot therefore be argued that the Moslems emphasise one part of the pledge and ignore the other. The *Times of India* correspondent says that the Premier's recent speech at the Guildhall seems to have gone on further than the pledge. We are sure it does, for the statement about misgovernment and the troublesomeness of Turkey now freshly interposed lends a sinister meaning to the former pledge. If it did not, why should Mr. Bonar Law have to state that "Mr. Lloyd George saw no reason to disseminate any portion of his speech of January 5, 1918?"

We recognise the force of the second part of the third objection. But there is a reply to that. The principles of nationality need not be ignored in the case of Arabia. If the *Times'* correspondent has cared to study Moslem opinion on the subject, he will find that solution out of the difficulty created by Mr. Lloyd

George's engagements with regard to an Arab kingdom, has been offered. Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall*, that great student of the Turkish question, wrote in July last:—"If our rulers did me the honour to consult me"—and Lord Cromer did do him the honour on a previous occasion—"I should say: 'It is better that you gentlemen should suffer a trifling humiliation than that England should be dishonoured and her Empire wrecked. But there is still an easy way out of your difficulty. Set up your Arab Federation of self-governing states. When that is done you have, I understand, to find a mandatory from the League of Nations. Who will watch over their welfare and be responsible to the League for their right guidance? Turkey must be a member of the League of Nations; the Muslim world insists on that. Well, give the mandate for the Arab State to Turkey. There will be rejoicings everywhere and you will have stepped out of a nasty fix quite gracefully. But someone objects that would be to put things back in the position where they were before. Surely not! Since we have been assured that a mandate from the League of Nations is a very different thing from actual sovereignty or free possession! It involves some measure of responsibility. It carries with it the idea of supervision by the League and also, as I think, a promise of assistance from the League when needed.'" The logic of this suggestion must be obvious to any one, though it may not be palatable.)

4. No statement is farther from the fact than the one

* He has since been appointed Editor of the *Bombay Chronicle* in which paper he exposes the cause of Khilafat very ably.

made in the last objection *viz.* that the Turkish rule has had evil results *everywhere*. The writer quotes from a recent historian but forgets that the story of the blight of Turkey told even by his historian is regarding "Hungary, Croatia, Serbia, Greece, Rumania, Bosnia or Bulgaria"—no Eastern country is named. But assume that the historian has intended his sweeping statement to apply everywhere, as the *Times*' correspondent would have it. Is the statement indisputable? If we may quote the opinion of Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, whose authority is to us as good as the unknown historian, he says, "The popularity of the Turkish and Persian Governments with their own subjects, and with all Asiatic peoples, is far greater than the popularity of any European Government." But we might perhaps rely more in this connection on the balanced and weighty opinion of a great name whose authority probably the *Times*' correspondent also will not question—we mean Mr. Gladstone. Said he in 1877, when the Eastern question was much engaging the attention of the European political world:—"If I find the Turk incapable of establishing a good, just and well proportioned government over civilised and Christian races, it does not follow that he is under a similar incapacity when his task shall only be to hold empire over populations wholly or principally *Oriental*s and *Mahomedans*. On this head I do not know that any verdict of guilty has yet been found by a competent tribunal."

We now come to the writer's "general considerations" with which he has prefaced the discussion of the problem. The most important of them, according to him,

is that Turkey has been defeated, and it is alleged that this consideration is ignored by those who talk of a just and honourable peace. Well, if we may complete a statement which is only half stated, the fact is that Turkey, and hence the Khalif, though defeated in the battlefield, has not been beaten in the field of loyalty. He has triumphed in the allegiance of the whole Muslim world. And what though he has been beaten even in the battlefield? He has been beaten with the help of the Indian Moslem, who bound by civil allegiance to his King Emperor fought on the side of the King's armies, in the full assurance that the question of the Khalifate would in no way be touched. And it is when he has now come to be sadly disillusioned that he is indignant, that he fasts and prays, and still hopes that in the Empire to which he belongs, his sentiments and feelings will be respected. However that may be, is it dignified on the part of a nation whose statesmen until quite recently believed that the end of the Turkish Empire would mean the beginning of the end of the British Empire, to say that Turkey is a defeated nation and that it should be dealt with in a spirit which is neither martial nor chivalrous, but *commercial*?

The writer has spoken with much gusto about Turkey's obligations to France and England. Well, many of the obligations done by them were acts of service done no less for themselves than for Turkey. And even if they were in the nature of obligations, we do not think Turkey all of a sudden forgot them, and declared enmity in gratitude of the services. But let our historian answer the charge: "They say that Young Turks were pro-Germans

and therefore enemies of England from the first. That is a downright lie. The enthusiasm of the Young Turks for England at the Revolution is everywhere recorded, and of my personal knowledge I can say that in 1913 the Young Turks wished that England should assume the instructorship of the whole Ottoman Empire, the army included, for ten years. The mere suggestion was refused. Then men like Enver Pasha who had voted for the suggestion as a forlorn hope, said: 'You see, they dare not act alone. England has become the tail of Russia. She has sunk to the position of a third-rate power. The only chance which now remains to us is Germany.'.....They say that Turkey had become the enemy of England. It is true that she fought for her bare existence. But that was not till after we had become the enemy of Turkey, the close confederate of Tsarist Russia, whose aim was to destroy the Ottoman Empire."

But why reproach the Moslems with repeated reminders that Turkey is a defeated country? The truth has painfully gone home to them, and they have learnt the lesson of being satisfied with second best solutions of the question. The writer of the *Times* articles was, we fear, too much preoccupied with picking holes in the logic of the few people he had come across, to see what was happening in the Moslem world. Thus he would never have made the statement that the Moslems are a body of men "who are uninspired by a constructive policy and that nobody has produced a plan which is at once workable and acceptable," had he cared to know of to take count of what happened at the great Essex Hall meeting in London held in May last, or what the *elite* and the

informed Moslem section in England who surely represent Moslems in India, think and have done in the matter. Sir Abbas Ali Baig, who was requested to preside at the Khilafat Conference and who is one of the deputation that is to be sent to England, addressed a letter to the Essex Hall meeting, wherein, after a careful discussion of the question, he suggested these as the Moslem claims:—

(1) The holy places and sacred buildings of Islam should remain in Moslem possession under Moslem sovereignty as before the war.

(2) Turkish Thrace and Constantinople being part of the homeland of the Turks, must remain under the sovereignty of the Ottoman Sultan.

(3) The secret treaties, so far as they aim of the dismemberment of Moslem region (in the guise of emancipatory measures or mandates) should be deemed invalid, as they are opposed to the agreed principles of a peace settlement.

(4) The Moslem races should be left unfettered if they desire to organise an Islamic federation under the hegemony of any state selected by them.

(5) No mandate should be imposed on any Moslem region unless the populations concerned desire it by an expression of their free-will.

(6) Moslem races should be free to choose their sovereignty or other form of Government acceptable to them.

(7) The criterion of a plebiscitum should be applied in all Moslem regions to ascertain the will of the populations concerned in regard to point 4, 5 and 6.

Shaikh M.H. Kidwai * of Gadia suggested the following constructive scheme in July last :—

* Another member of the Khilafat deputation sent to England.

(1) Thrace and the whole of Asia Minor should form the main State of a United or Federated Ottoman Empire with Constantinople as the capital of the constitutional Sultan.

(2) To the main State should be united or joined a number of Self-Governing States either on the lines of the United States, the German States or the British Colonies, viz., Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Armenia, Egypt, Tripoli, Albania, those portions of the Black Sea littoral with a preponderant Turkish-speaking Moslem population. These states should be members of the League of Nations and they may have the option of asking through the League of Nations, but by the sanction of the paramount and parent State, Turkey, foreign administrators if they need.

These are articulate statements, formulated in the terms now familiarised by the Peace Conference, of the sentiments throbbing in every Moslem's breast. Or is it contended that even they are the demands of "idealists and mere sentimentalists," to whose ear "the voice of reason does not readily penetrate?"

THE KHILAFAT QUESTION

(December 24, 1919.)

The *Times of India* deserves to be congratulated for keeping the Khilafat question alive before the public. In a leading article of the 20th instant, it refers to a note *

* The following is the note referred to :—The *Times of India* reproduces report of a debate in the House of Commons containing references

in our last issue and wishes us to believe that Mr. Balfour must have meant exactly the same as the Premier did when the latter gave his pledge regarding the integrity of Turkey in his 5th of January speech. We repeat that Mr. Balfour deliberately chose to be silent about the pledge in his speech in the course of the debate on the British intervention in Russia. What does Mr. Bonar Law's statement on the subject show? Lieut. Col. the Hon. Aubrey Herbert pointedly asked : " In view of the vital importance to the British Empire that a decision with regard to Turkish peace be reached at the present

to the Turkish treaty. Mr. Balfour is reported to have said : " He was not going to pronounce on the final destiny of the Turkish Empire, but this they might say with certainty that a great historic people like the Turks were not going to be wiped off the map of the world by any arrangement which might be sanctioned at a Peace Conference wherever it sat. The Turkish people had had a great past. They were there, and if all that we possessed and believed about self-determination and nationalities was to find its exemplification with regard to the Turks as it did with regard to other people it was certain that after Peace there would be a Turkish Empire, as it was uncertain at this moment what the precise bounds of the Empire might be. " Fine words, indeed, about the greatness of a people and their great past, but fine words butter no parsnips, much less allay the sentiments of a community that wants definite, real assurances. In fact it is impossible to make out what Mr. Balfour means, or whether he means anything at all. We do not know what is Mr. Balfour's idea of a Turkish Empire. Does he mean to say that there would be a Turkish Empire worth the name even after its limbs are torn and dissevered? And the assurance that there would be a Turkish Empire loses any value that it may have from the statement made in the same speech that " it was impossible for any Government to speak of itself as to the policy which it would pursue. " It may also be noted that though Mr. Balfour was replying to the speakers who preceded him, and though one of them pointedly referred to the Premier's 5th January speech and hoped for a settlement in accordance with the promise made therein, Mr. Balfour kept studiously silent about the point.

Conference with M. Clemenceau, will Mr. Lloyd George say that his pledge of January 5, 1918 will 'be carried out?' Mr. Bonar Law gave an "assurance" that in dealing with the very difficult question of a settlement with Turkey the considerations mentioned would not be overlooked. Is this a straight reply to a straight question? The fact is, as we have pointed out in an article on the Khilafat question in our issue of December 3 * the Premier himself does not appear seriously to mean to carry out the pledge. And if Mr. Lloyd George himself evades the issue, how can Mr. Balfour help doing it? It is this uncertainty of the situation that is galling and that is at the basis of the whole Muslim agitation. It is misrepresenting facts to say that the Mahomedans are fighting the principle of nationality. They want on the contrary a definite assurance that Turkey is going to be treated on the principle of nationality. The *Times of India* goes also to say that in his reply † to Mr. Candler, Mr. Gandhi acclaims the principle in one sentence and disclaims it in the next. We ask our contemporary to re-read the reply. What, it has been asked, has the treatment or ill-treatment by the Turks of the subject races to do with the Khilafat? Must you wrench Constantinople from the Turks, if you want to safeguard the right of the subject races? Must you for the same purpose deprive them of their custody of their holy places? The answer must be emphatically "No." And yet that is what the Mahomedans apprehend is proposed to be done.

* Refer to page 183 for the article mentioned.

† Not reproduced here.

We have examined in the article already referred to, the argument that Turkey is not certainly going to fare worse than other enemy countries. What is the principle on which those countries have been treated? Are you going to apply the same principle to Turkey? That is what Mr. Gandhi asked in his reply to Mr. Candler's letter. If you say that those countries have been dealt with on the basis of a plebiscite, why not, the Mahommedans ask, extend the same principle to Turkey? Those countries are claimed to be partitioned on the grounds of the principle of plebiscite, whereas in Turkey the conditions are such that the very principle of plebiscite demands that the country should not be partitioned.

The fact is the Mahommedans do not want anything more than an application of the principle of nationality. They point out the glaring injustice of placing Moslems even where they are in a majority under the rule of non-Moslem minorities. They ask if such a step would be in accordance with the principle of nationality. That is the question which responsible statesmen have all along refused to reply. The question was very ably discussed sometime ago in a document addressed to President Wilson, and we can do no better than summarise the facts and figures therein. The Armenians are the oppressed nationalities whose liberation is claimed to be brought about by the creation of an Armenian State. "The Armenians, however", says the document "are minorities enclosed in the midst of a great and overwhelming majority of Mussalmans. The creation of an Armenian State would only be possible where the Armenians lived in more or less compact masses, and its extent and limits can only be fixed on

the spot," "In 1896," the document goes on, "at the session of the Chamber of Deputies on November 3, Mr. Gabriel Hanotaux, then French Minister for Foreign Affairs, declared that according to the statistics, the Armenian population certainly did not represent a proportion of more than 13 per. cent of the inhabitants. It is needless to say that neither this declaration nor the statistics in question had been prepared in defence of the Turkish cause." Then come the Greeks. M. Venizelos' claim is that the Greeks in Asia Minor are in a majority. The document says: "The Greeks in Asia have mingled with the Turks and do not form a separate race. They live in small minorities amidst Turkish majorities. For the purpose of masking the great numerical inferiority of the Greeks upon the Asiatic continent, M. Venizelos adds the population of the Archipelago to his fictitious estimates. The Ottoman Isles of the Archipelago are indeed very greatly inhabited by the Greeks, but they are at the present moment subject to occupation by foreign troops. They have no ethnographic or administrative connection with Anatolia, which is almost exclusively inhabited by Turks. . . . The Vilayet of Aidin (Smyrna)"—which M. Venizelos claims to be predominantly Greek—"measures 53,798 kilometres. The Greek element is only concentrated in the Sandjak of Smyrna, where it forms one-fifth of the population. According to the last estimates the sandjaks of this Vilayet comprise:—Sandjak of Smyrna 6,30,000 inhabitants, whereof 1,30,000 are Greeks: Aidin 3,00,000 (15,000 Greeks); Sarouhan 4,50,000 (33,000 Greeks); Denizli, 2,70,000 (2600 Greeks); Menteche, 1,90,000 (10,500 Greeks). We believe there is no need to add

other commentaries to these eloquent figures." But the complaint does not end there. The Allied Powers, as is aptly put in the document from which we are quoting, "wish to liberate certain Mussalman peoples of the Ottoman Empire, peoples that have never expressed a desire in that direction, for our Empire is a Mussalman state, in which Arabs and Kurds enjoy the same rights as the Turks. Islam recognises no differences of nationality. Are we then to be freed from our own rule? That is a pretext to destroy us and reduce us to slavery..... There must not be two sorts of Justice. If you desire really to apply the principles of Justice, why exclude the Turkish nation and the Mussalmans? Why wrench from them their patrimony? The Ottoman Empire constitutes an indivisible whole, in which among Turks, Arabs and Kurds there are neither oppressors nor oppressed."

But it will be asked, how about the subject races who, though they be in a minority, should be safeguarded? If protection is to be afforded them, should they be asked to clear out of the Turkish territory and go and stop elsewhere, say, Russia? The proposition is undignified even if it was practicable. The solution is to be sought in some such suggestion as the one made by Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall with regard to Arabia, and which we referred to in our article of December 3rd. It is: "Set up your federation of self-governing states. When that is done you have, I understand, to find a mandatory from the League of Nations. Who will watch over their welfare and be responsible to the League for their right guidance? Turkey must be a member of the League of Nations; the Muslim world insists on that. Well, give

the mandate over these States to Turkey. There will be rejoicings everywhere and you will have stepped out of a nasty fix quite gracefully. But some one objects, that would be to put things back in the position where they were before. Surely not! Since we have been assured that a mandate from the League of Nations is a very very different thing from actual sovereignty or free possession, it involves some measure of responsibility. It carries with it the idea of supervision by the League, and also a promise of assistance when needed." We can think of no other proposition which can better keep the principle of nationality intact and satisfy all the parties.

But we have entered into an unnecessarily long argument. The British statesmen are not even prepared to make definite declarations about the purely and exclusively Turkish portion of Turkey, much less consider the question of the predominantly Turkish portion of Turkey. It is such a declaration that the Muslim world wants, and in doing so it does not claim more than what has been solemnly promised by President Wilson and the Premier nor goes further than any enemy power does.

"IN PROCESS OF KEEPING."

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 12, 1920.)

The writer of 'Current Topics' in the *Times of India* has attempted to challenge the statement made in my Khilafat article* regarding ministerial pledges, and in doing so, cites Mr. Asquith's Guild Hall speech of

* " Why I have Joined the Khilafat movement." See page 139.

November 10, 1914. When I wrote the article, I had in mind Mr. Asquith's speech. I am sorry that he ever made that speech. For, in my humble opinion, it betrayed, to say the least, a confusion of thought. Could he think of the Turkish people as apart from the Ottoman Government? And what is the meaning of the death-knell of Ottoman Dominion in Europe and Asia if it be not the death-knell of Turkish rule and therefore also of the Turkish people as a free and governing race? Is it, again, true historically that the Turkish rule has always been a blight that 'has withered some of the fairest regions of the earth?' And what is the meaning of his statement that followed, viz., "Nothing is further from our thoughts than to initiate or encourage a crusade against their belief?" If words have any meaning, the qualifications that Mr. Asquith introduced in his speech should have meant a scrupulous regard for Indian Muslim feeling. And if that be the meaning of his speech, without anything further to support me I would claim that even Mr. Asquith's assurance is in danger of being set at nought if the resolutions of the San Remo Conference † are to be crystallised into

† Mr. M. K. Gandhi expressed the following opinion on the decisions of the San Remo Conference :—The cablegram regarding the decision of the Conference at San Remo is most disquieting. The decision is bound to greatly disturb the Mahomedan mind. I hope, however, that the Mahomedan leaders, will neither be disheartened nor give way to anger. The issues involved are tremendous. The greatest self-restraint is therefore, absolutely necessary. Non-co-operation is, I remain convinced, the only remedy enabling India to give disciplined expression to the deep wound that is being made into her very heart. The way to be trodden is, I know, weary and full of thorns, but I am certain that it is possible to wrench justice from an Alliance that prides itself on its brute force. I know that

action. But I base my remarks on a considered speech made by Mr. Asquith's successor two years later when things had assumed a more threatening shape than in 1914 and when the need for Indian help was much greater than in 1914. His pledge would bear repetition till it is fulfilled. He said: "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race". "We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople". If only every word of this pledge is fulfilled both in letter and in spirit, there would be little left for quarrelling about. In so far as Mr. Asquith's declaration can be considered hostile to the Indian Muslim claim, it is superseded by the later and more considered declaration of Mr. Lloyd George—a declaration made irrevocable by fulfilment of the consideration it expected viz., the enlistment of the brave Mahamedan soldiery which fought in the very place which is now being partitioned in spite of the pledge. But the writer of 'Current Topics'

the temptation to answer violence with violence is almost irresistible, yet, I feel certain that the slightest violence done by us will not only return to us with mad fury but will dash to pieces the present hope of Islam, whereas, the completely peaceful withdrawal of co-operation must inevitably result in a revision of any arrangement that the Powers might make regarding Turkey and that can be demonstrated to be unjust and a breach of the solemn promises made by His Majesty's Ministers. To those who distrust non-co-operation, I can only say, in all humility, you will accelerate the eruption of violence, if you succeed in defeating the scheme of non-co-operation and cannot replace it by some definite course of strong action, which must be more than a mere protest, so much more, that resort to it must bring about this desired end.

says Mr Lloyd George " is now in process of keeping his pledge." I hope he is right. But what has already happened gives little ground for any such hope. For, imprisonment or internment of the Khalif in his own capital will be not only a mockery of fulfilment but it would be adding injury to insult. Either the Turkish Empire is to be maintained in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople or it is not. If it is, let the Indian Mahomedans feel the full glow of it, or if the Empire is to be broken up, let the mask of hypocrisy be lifted and India see the truth in its nakedness. To join the Khilafat movement then means to join a movement to keep inviolate the pledge of a British minister. Surely, such a movement is worth much greater sacrifice than may be involved in non-co-operation.

KHILAFAT AND NON-VIOLENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 1, 1921.)

Mr. Vaze of the *Servant of India* has referred me to the article of Mr. Zacharias in his weekly of 5th May last, and asked me to consider the Khilafat from the point of view suggested by the writer. Mr. Zacharias thus puts the question in his elaborate article, "How could one find an apostle of the principle of Ahimsa upholding its very contradiction,—the principle of the Khilafat? I am not concerned with the true value of either the Khilafat or the Ahimsa principle. But I do say that the one excludes the other, the one thing I do

plead for and most earnestly, is clear thinking on the part of either side to this problem. It is muddled thinking and the consequent slide into compromise that is responsible for disaster in the recent history of mankind more than any other factor." After instancing ex-President Wilson's fall, the writer goes on: "Will the great Satyagrahi of the East heed the warning? Will he be faithful to his whole life?...Will he not remain true to himself rather than compromise himself, for the sake even of so precious a thing as Hindu-Muslim friendship is, with this antithesis of his, the principle of Khilafat?"

This fervent appeal requires a restatement of my position regarding the Khilafat. I would be false to my whole life, if even for securing Hindu-Muslim Unity, I compromised the principle of non-violence for which I do claim to stand. It was only when I found that the Mussalman claim was just from every point of view, that I plunged myself into it. For me it was a chance of a lifetime. I felt that if I could but show my loyalty to my Mussalman countrymen in the hour of their trial, I would be able to secure everlasting friendship between the two great communities. Any way I felt that the attempt was worth making. I could not conceive the possibility of having a free India without a real friendship between the two.

But, argues Mr. Zacharias, the Khilafat is based on force. The Khalifa is the earthly representative of Islam pledged to defend it even with the sword. And how can I, a believer in non-violence, fight to sustain an institution that is permitted to resort to physical force for its defence?

Mr. Zacharias is right in his description of the Khilafat. He is wrong in his estimate of the function of a votary of non-violence. A believer in non-violence is pledged not to resort to violence or physical force either directly or indirectly in defence of anything, but he is not precluded from helping men or institutions that are themselves not based on non-violence. If the reverse were the case, I would, for instance, be precluded from helping India to attain Swaraj because the future Parliament of India under Swaraj, I know for certain, will be having some military and police forces, or to take a domestic illustration, I may not help a son to secure justice, because forsooth he is not a believer in non-violence.

Mr. Zacharias' proposition will reduce all commerce by a believer in non-violence to an impossibility. And there are not wanting men, who do believe that complete non-violence means complete cessation of all activity.

Not such, however, is my doctrine of non-violence. My business is to refrain from doing any violence myself, and to induce by persuasion and service as many of God's creatures as I can, to join me in the belief and practice. But I would be untrue to my faith, if I refused to assist in a just cause any men or measures that did not entirely coincide with the principle of non-violence. I would be promoting violence, if, finding the Mussalmans to be in the right, I did not assist them by means strictly non-violent against those who had treacherously plotted the destruction of the dignity of Islam. Even when both parties believe in violence, there is often such a thing as justice on one side or the other. A robbed man has

justice on his side, even though he may lie preparing to regain the lost property by force. And it would be accounted as a triumph of non-violence, if the injured party could be persuaded to regain his property by methods of Satyagraha, i.e. love or soul-force rather than free fight.

Of course it is open to Mr. Zacharias to reject my claim as a devotee of non-violence, in view of all the limitations I have mentioned. I can only suggest to him that life is a very complex thing, and truth and non-violence present problems, which often defy analysis and judgment. One discovers truth and the method of applying the only legitimate means of vindicating it i. e. Satyagraha or soul-force, by patient endeavour and silent prayer. I can only assure friends that I spare no pains to grope my way to the right, and that humble but constant endeavour and silent prayer are always my two trusty companions along the weary but beautiful path that all seekers must tread.

MR. GANDHI'S KHILAFAT SPEECH

(March 24, 1920.)

[The following is a verbatim report of Mr. Gandhi's speech at the Khilafat meeting held at Bombay on the 19th March 1920, while moving the only resolution adopted by the meeting.]

It gives me the greatest pleasure to be able to move the only resolution of this great conference. I beg to congratulate the organisers and the volunteers on the splendid success of the peaceful demonstration of to-day. We had many warnings given to us as to the consequences that were likely to follow from suspension of business.

Bombay at least has, thanks to the effort of the Khilafat Committee, behaved nobly in the matter. The hartal was spontaneous and voluntary. No pressure whatever was used. It was a matter of great satisfaction to me to note that the Committee followed the advice tendered by me that mill-hands should not be called upon to participate in the hartal. In these days of tension between employers and employees in the various industrial concerns of the country, we may not encourage labourers to absent themselves from work without the willing consent of the employers.

Our resolution divides itself into four parts. The first part consists of a protest and a prayer. It protests against violent and irresponsible agitation set up in England in connection with the Khilafat question, and appeals to the Ministers and other statesmen to dissociate themselves from this agitation and reassure us of the fellow-feeling of the people of the United Kingdom by securing an honorable settlement consistent with the just religious sentiments of the Mussalmans of India. The second part warns those concerned that an adverse solution is likely to eventuate in complete withdrawal of co-operation from the Government and will put an undue strain upon Indian loyalty, and if such a step unfortunately becomes a necessity, there is likely to be excitement. The third part of the resolution warns the people in the most emphatic language against violence of speech or deed and gives it as the opinion of this great meeting that any exercise of violence is calculated to injure the sacred cause and to do irreparable harm. So far, the resolution is a joint transaction between the Hindus, Mahomedans and others to whom

this great land is their mother-country or their adopted home.

And it commits the joint movement to a policy of non-violence in the course of the struggle. But Mahomedans have special Koranic obligations in which Hindus may or may not join. They, therefore, reserve to themselves the right, in the event of the failure of non-co-operation *cum* non-violence in order to enforce justice, to resort to all such methods as may be enjoined by the Islamic scriptures. I venture heartily to associate myself with this resolution. I consider the resolution to be thoroughly respectful and moderate in tone. I see on the platform Shias and Sunnis, Hindus and Parsis, all joined together in a respectful demonstration. Complete closure of the great Hindu cloth-market and Hindu houses are an eloquent testimony of Hindu agreement with the Muslim demand. The unholy agitation set up in London has evoked an outburst of feeling in India which will never die until justice is done. It is a matter of painful surprise that even Lord Curzon, with all his knowledge and experience of India, should have allied himself with the ignorant agitation.

A SILVER LINING.

There is however, a silver lining to the cloud that has gathered overhead. Mr. Montagu has been our uncompromising advocate. Mr. Lloyd George has at last reaffirmed his memorable declaration though in a somewhat halting form. I believe that the Government of India is pressing forward our claim with great firmness. The Anglo-Indian press has not been hostile. The *Times*

of *India* and the Bengal Chamber of Commerce have even warmly espoused our cause. The resolution invites all Englishmen to rally round the banner of Truth and vindicate British honour and the pledged word of the British Premier. I yield to no one in my loyalty to the British connection, but I must refuse to buy that loyalty at the price of honour and at the sacrifice of the deeply-seated religious sentiments of one section of my countrymen. A loyalty that sells its soul is worth nothing, and if in spite of the acknowledged services of Indian soldiers, both Hindu and Mahomedan, during the late war, the promises made by British statesmen are broken, the reasons that evoke the loyalty of India will have ceased to exist. I do not lose hope, but if the hope is disappointed and the worst happens, God alone knows what will happen to this fair land of ours. We know this, that there will be neither peace nor rest for the Government or the people until the wrong is righted and the feelings of eight crores of Mahomedans are respected.

PERFECTLY HONOURABLE.

I hope it is unnecessary to show why it is obligatory on Hindus to march side by side with their Mahomedan countrymen. So long as the means and the end are honourable, I can imagine no better cement for perpetually binding us both than our complete association with Mahomedans. But in a cause so sacred as this there can be, there should be, no violence either of speech or of deed. We must conquer not by hate but by love. I admit the difficulty of loving the unjust, but victory consists not in marching along a smooth surface but in

conquering obstacles in a resolute and undaunted way. And in a just and sacred cause, firmness of purpose and unconquerable will are the least qualities required of us. Moreover violence can only damage this great cause. It may create a sensation but we shall never reach the goal through a series of sensations. The non-violence clause of the resolution, therefore, definitely recognises the wisdom of self-restraint and enjoins upon all speakers to refrain from making wild or exaggerated speeches which can only lead to bloodshed, ruthless repression and humiliation of both the Government and the people. But the Mahomedans want to play a perfectly honourable game.

MUSLIM OBLIGATIONS

They wish to reserve or suppress nothing. Some of them have, therefore, insisted upon the insertion of a proviso to the resolution, meaning that if non-violence fails, they are at liberty to resort to the other methods enjoined upon them by the Koran and these are that when their religion is assailed, they should leave the country in which it is assailed or war against the assailant. And so the resolution undoubtedly foreshadows, in the most honourable and unmistakable manner, the stages through which this great movement will pass, the last stage being a bloody revolution. God forbid that this country should have to pass through such a revolution and all its horrors but the feeling on this Khilafat question runs so high and goes so deep that an unjust solution may, if peaceful means fail, land this country in a revolutionary movement the like of which we have not seen before, and if it comes, responsibility will rest with Englishmen, the Hindus and the

timid Mahomedans. If Englishmen will only recognise the existence of the deep feeling and a necessity of the just decision, all would be well. If the Hindus will understand the neighbourly duty and actively co-operate with the Mahomedans, they can, by united and perfectly peaceful efforts, force a just solution. Timid Mahomedans by shedding their timidity at this critical moment of their history will also prevent bloodshed by letting the party of violence to understand that there are no deserters of the flag of Islam. If, then, revolution is to be our lot, it will come through sheer despair staring honest, honourable high-souled Mahomedans in the face and giving them a feeling of being neglected by Englishmen, Hindus and their co-religionists. I hope, therefore, that the whole of India will unite in a prayer to the Almighty and in a cry of justice that shall not be denied. I venture finally to hope that the Government will not anticipate revolution by thoughtless and angry repression. They will recognise that India is no longer an infant and that Indians have the same feelings that actuate Englishmen in similar circumstances.

THE NEW STAGE

(April 14, 1920.)

It is for the last twelve months that the Khilafat question has been hammered both in England and in India. In its first stage the question was more systematically agitated in England than here. The Moslem leaders in England focussed the Moslem view of the vital problems affecting Islam and made it

known to the Peace Conference. They pleaded their case before the British ministers and the public alike. It was the failure of these efforts and the trend of the happenings in Paris that came as a cruel awakener to India. The Mahomedan leaders in India could see that the Allied Powers were all without exception overborne by the heavy weight of the selfish interests involved in the secret treaties. They then lost no time in forming a deputation, and what was till then called a wild cry by some, assumed a shape; the minimum of the Muslim demand was issued. The first batch of the Deputation proceeded to England.

This Khilafat Deputation saw the great leader of the Liberal party. * They also presented their case to the Premier. The results of these interviews we all know already. † The Delegation's efforts are not confined

*Mr. Gandhi sent the following message to the Deputation (*Young India* Feb. 11, 1920) "Deputation has sacred mission. It has to appeal not merely to Imperial Government and British opinion but has to win world opinion. Its strength lies in its ability to appeal to reason and justice. It must therefore be moderate in presentation and firm in demand. Odds from a worldly stand-point seem heavily against us, but in Prophet's words minority of two when it has God on its side can face overwhelming numbers with confidence and hope. In my opinion Hindu India solidly on your side for your cause is not merely scripturally true but it is morally just and presently England will be on our side when through Deputation Englishmen learn that *British honour is at stake* in this question for we are asking nothing more than what British Ministers have pledged themselves to give. May God guide Deputation."

† In this connection *Young India* wrote on March 31, 1920:—In view of the extraordinary moderation and calmness with which the Khilafat Deputation 'put their case before the Premier of England, the blunt, unimaginative and unresponsive reply of the latter is the more extre-

to personal interviews only. They addressed a crowded meeting at Essex Hall on 23rd March. There was a large English audience. The meeting is reported to have created an excellent impression on the audience, including notable English publicists. The *Bombay Chronicle* correspondent informs that a larger meeting is to follow shortly.

The decision of the Khilafat question rests with the Big Four. Of these the Italian Minister Signor Nitti is one. His speech and the response he received from the Chamber make it clear that Italy does not desire territorial acquisitions in Turkey or Asia Minor. He declared that it would be a mistake to arouse the religious feelings of the Moslems. But from beyond the Atlantic has been coming unhappy news: "The American reply to the Allied Note regarding the Turkish Treaty negotiations expressed the opinion that the part of East Thrace outside the Constantinople zone should be given to Greece, but Adrianople and Kirkkilliseh and the surrounding territory should be given to Bulgaria. The boundaries of Armenia should be drawn so as to recognise all legitimate claims of the Armenians, particularly for an easy access to the sea. It (the reply) suggests

mely to be regretted. Mr. Mahomad Ali put the minimum Muslim demand in the clearest and most dispassionate terms. He condemned the massacres and urged that an International Commission be appointed to enquire into the alleged atrocities. Condign punishment may then be awarded to the real culprits. But Mr. Lloyd George would have nothing of this and indulged in lot of rhetorical phrasiology seeking justification for the adoption of stringent measures against Turkey. "Turkey like Germany and Austria had been beaten," said the Premier, "Germany and Austria have paid the penalty for defeat. Germany has had justice, pretty terrible justice. Why should Turkey escape?"

that Trebizond should be given to Armenia and that Turkey should place Mesopotamia, Arabia, Palestine, and Syria and the Islands in the hands of the Great Power for disposal." The still more unpleasant piece of news is the conclusion of the American Armenian Commission Report. It reads: "The only solution of the Near East problem is to give some Power a mandate which should also include Constantinople." Reading these two telegrams one can appreciate the Deputation's wise decision of paying a visit to the United States. A message has been already addressed to Senator Lodge and the American Press. This appeal urges an impartial inquiry into the whole history of the question of the so called "Massacres" by an international Commission, including an adequate number of Indians selected by the Indian people themselves. It complains that the Turk record of massacres has grown blacker and bulkier merely on the *ex parte* allegations. It further asks America to suspend its judgment pending the result of the first fair investigation. The Deputation conclude: "Please place this our appeal before the Senate, also the House of Representatives and America generally." We are sure that the Khilafat Deputation will easily traverse the fallacies and contradictions involved in President Wilson's *volte face* policy. They will prove to America how the sometime champion of self-determination has himself sinned against his Twelfth Point and his Mount Vernon speech.

Though the representatives of the Allied Nations refuse to acknowledge the justice of the Moslem case, we do not feel quite dispirited of the Christian public at

large. And it is clear that the Deputation is determined to take their cause to every ear that hears not. Such diligence on the part of our Moslem brethren is convincing enough to show that they are trying *all* constitutional methods unsparingly.

In their anxiety to avoid all future bitterness the Moslem leaders have been consistently frank in expressing the Moslem opinion. They have with their characteristic frankness protested against the arrest of Shaik-ul-Islam. The speeches in the meeting held in Bombay on Friday last, have once again repeated the just demands of the Mahomedans and the means they propose to use in case the Settlement would not be satisfactory. To cease co-operation with the Government is a serious thing, no doubt. And the Mahomedans would have avoided it if they could. But at last they found themselves cornered and a beginning had to be made. The resignation of titles, as it were, lays the foundation. Here the Khilafat movement reaches a new stage. We heartily wish that the Christian Powers still appreciate the serious situation and stop their unchristian conspiracy.

THE PREMIER'S REPLY

(April 28, 1920.)

The English mail has brought us a full and official report of the Premier's speech which he recently made when he received the Khilafat deputation. Mr. Lloyd George's speech is more definite and therefore more disappointing than H. E. the Viceroy's reply to the deputation.

here. He draws quite unwarranted deductions from the same high principles on which he had based his own pledge only two years ago. He declares that Turkey must pay the penalty of defeat. This determination to punish Turkey does not become one whose immediate predecessor had, in order to appease Muslim soldiers, promised that the British Government had no designs on Turkey and that His Majesty's Government would never think of punishing the Sultan for the misdeeds of the Turkish Committee. Mr. Lloyd George has expressed his belief that the majority of the population of Turkey did not really want to quarrel with Great Britain and that their rulers misled the country. In spite of this conviction and in spite of Mr. Asquith's promise, he is out to punish Turkey and punish it in the name of justice.

He expounds the principle of self-determination and justifies the scheme of depriving Turkey of its territories one after another. While justifying this scheme he does not exclude even Thrace and this strikes the reader most, because this very Thrace he had mentioned in his pledge as predominantly Turkish. Now we are told by him that both the Turkish census and the Greek census agree in pointing out that the Mussalman population in Thrace is in a considerable minority! Mr. Yakub Hussain speaking at the Madras Khilafat Conference has challenged the truth of this statement. The Prime Minister cites among others also the example of Smyrna where, he says, 'we had a most careful investigation by a very impartial committee in the whole of the question of Smyrna and it was found that considerable majority was non-Turkish.' Who

will believe the onesided "impartial committee's" investigations until it is disproved that thousands of Mussalmans have been murdered and hundreds of thousands have been driven away from their hearths and homes? Strangely enough, Mr. Lloyd George believes in the necessity of fresh investigations by a purposely appointed committee in Smyrna as the most authenticated and upto-date report, whereas he would not accept Mr. Mahomed Ali's proposal for an impartial commission in regard to Armenian massacres! Doubtful and one-sided facts and figures suffice for him even to conclude that the Turkish Government is incapable of protecting its subjects. And he proceeds to suggest foreign interference in ruling over Asia Minor in the interests of civilisation. Here he cuts at the root of the Sultan's independence. This proposal of appropriating supervision is distinctly unlike the treatment meted out to other enemy powers.

This detraction of the Sultan's suzerainty is only a corollary of the Premier's indifference towards the Muslim idea of the Kaliphate. The Premier's injustice in treating the Turkish question becomes graver when he thus lightly handles the Khilafat question. There had been occasions when the British have used to their advantage the Muslim idea of associating the Kaliph's spiritual power with temporal power. Now this very association is treated as a controversial question by the great statesman.

Will this raise the reputation of Great Britain or stain it? Can this be tolerated by those who fought against Turkey with full faith in British honesty? Mere receipts of gratitude cannot console the wounded Mussal-

mans. There lies the alternative for England to choose between two mandates—a mandate over some Turkish territories which is sure to lead to chaos all over the world and a mandate over the hearts of the Mahomedans which will redeem the pledged honour of Britain. The Prime Minister has made an unwise choice. This narrow view registers the latest temperature of British diplomacy.

KHILAFAT APPEAL

TO H. E. THE VICEROY

(June 30, 1920.)

[The following representation was sent to H. E. the Viceroy on behalf of the Indian Mussalmans by many prominent leaders including the Hon. Mr. Mazrul Hacque, Mr. Yakub Hasan, Moulana Abdul Bari, Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Azad.]

We, the undersigned, claim to represent the largest body of Sunni Muslim opinion. We have most carefully read the Turkish peace terms, and we consider them to be in direct violation of the religious sentiments of Mussalmans. They violate the obligations imposed upon Sunnis and wound the susceptibilities of all Mussalmans. They are contrary to the pledges of British Ministers on the strength of which it has been admitted it was possible to draw upon India for Muslim recruits during the war.

We hold that the British Empire which is "the greatest Mahomedan Power" in the world cannot treat the Turkish Empire which represents the Khilafat, in the

same manner that it may treat a defeated enemy. Indeed we contend that in certain respects Turkey has been treated worse than the other Powers. We respectfully submit that in the treatment of Turkey the British Government are bound to respect Indian Muslim sentiment in so far as it is neither unjust or unreasonable. In our opinion the position taken up by Indian Mussalmans is simple. They cannot bear the thought of the temporal power of the Sultan being adversely affected by way of punishment, for his having joined Germany under circumstances which need not be examined here. But we have no desire to ask for anything that would interfere with the principle of self-determination. We have no desire to uphold any misrule such as has been attributed to Turkey. Our delegates in Europe have asked for an independent commission of inquiry to investigate the charge of wanton cruelty said to have been practised by Turkish soldiers in Armenia. We cannot look with indifference upon the partition of Turkey and her Empire for the sake of punishing or humiliating her.

We would therefore request Your Excellency and your Government to ask His Majesty's ministers to secure a revision of the peace terms and tell them that on failure to do so, Your Excellency will make common cause with the people of India. We make this suggestion as Your Excellency has repeatedly declared that your Government has consistently and often pressed upon the attention of His Majesty's Ministers the case of Indian Mussalmans in this matter of vital concern to the vast majority of them. We feel, therefore, that we

have a right to ask Your Excellency to reassure the Mussalmans of India that they still retain your active co-operation and powerful advocacy in the prosecution of their claims even to the point of resignation of your high office, should His Majesty's Ministers fail to secure a revision of the terms consistently with the pledges and the sentiment mentioned above. We venture respectfully to suggest that had India been a Dominion enjoying full self-government, her responsible ministers would have as a matter of course, resigned as a protest against such a serious breach of pledges and flouting of religious opinion as are involved in the peace terms.

If unfortunately Your Excellency will not adopt our humble suggestion, we shall be obliged as from the first August next to withdraw co-operation from the Government and to ask our co-religionists and Hindu brethren to do likewise.

We ask Your Excellency not to regard our statement as a threat or in any way as a mark of disrespect. We claim to be as loyal subjects of the Crown as any in India. But we consider our loyalty to an earthly sovereign to be subservient to our loyalty to Islam. The latter enjoins upon every Mussalman to consider those who wantonly injure the status of the Khalifa to be enemies of Islam and to resist them with arms if necessary. We recognise that even if we had the power we must not resort to arms so long as any other means are at our disposal. We feel that the least that a Mussalman can do in these circumstances is not to assist those who are guilty of trying to reduce the Khilafat practically to nothingness.

It would therefore become our popular duty to refuse to co-operate with a Government which accepts the peace terms and advises acceptance thereof by us.

We shall hope that such a serious step as non-co-operation will not become necessary, but should it unfortunately happen to be otherwise, we assure Your Excellency that we shall strive our utmost to avoid violence. We fully recognise our responsibility. We know that any eruption of violence must check and injure the peaceful demonstration contemplated by us and what is more, the sacred cause which is dear to us as life. We shall therefore take up non-co-operation in progressive stages and so as to cause the least necessary dislocation or embarrassment to the Government and so as to enable us to control and discipline popular feeling.

CRITICISM OF THE MUSLIM MANIFESTO

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 7, 1920.)

The Khilafat representation addressed to the Viceroy * and my letter † on the same subject have been severely criticised by the Anglo-Indian press. The *Times of India* which generally adopts an impartial attitude has taken strong exception to certain statements made in the Muslim manifesto and has devoted a paragraph of its article to an adverse criticism of my suggestion that His Excellency should resign if the peace terms are not revised.

The *Times of India* excepts to the submission that the

* Page 217. † Page 165.

British Empire may not treat Turkey like a departed enemy. The signatories have, I think, supplied the best of reasons. They say : " We respectfully submit that in the treatment of Turkey the British Government are bound to respect Indian Muslim sentiment in so far as it is neither unjust nor unreasonable." If the seven crore Mussalmans are partners in the Empire, I submit that their wish must be held to be all sufficient for refraining from punishing Turkey. It is beside the point to quote what Turkey did during the war. It has suffered for it. The *Times* inquires wherein Turkey has been treated worse than the other Powers. I thought that the fact was self-evident. Neither Germany nor Austria and Hungary has been treated in the same way that Turkey has been. The whole of the Empire has been reduced to the retention of a portion of its capital, as it were to mock the Sultan and that too has been done under terms so humiliating that no self-respecting person, much less a reigning sovereign can possibly accept.

The *Times* has endeavoured to make capital out of the fact that the representation does not examine the reason for Turkey not joining the Allies. Well, there was no mystery about it. The fact of Russia being one of the Allies was enough to warn Turkey against joining them. With Russia knocking at the gate at the time of the war, it was not an easy matter for Turkey to join the Allies. But Turkey had cause to suspect Great Britain herself. She knew that England had done no friendly turn to her during the Bulgarian War. She was hardly well served at the time of the war with Italy. It was still no doubt a bad choice. With the Mussalmans of India awakened

and ready to support her, her statesmen might have relied upon Britain not being allowed to damage Turkey if she had remained with the Allies. But this is all wisdom after event. Turkey made a bad choice and she was punished for it. To humiliate her now is to ignore the Indian Mussalman sentiment. Britain may not do it, and retain the loyalty of the awakened Mussalmans of India.

For the *Times* to say that the peace terms strictly follow the principle of self-determination is to throw dust in the eyes of its readers. Is it the principle of self-determination that has caused the cessation of Adrianople and Thrace to Greece? By what principle of self-determination has Smyrna been handed to Greece? Have the inhabitants of Thrace and Smyrna asked for Grecian tutelege?

I decline to believe that the Arabs like the disposition that has been made of them. Who is the King of Hedjaj and who is Emir Feisul? Have the Arabs elected these kings and chiefs? Do the Arabs like the Mandate being taken by England? By the time the whole thing is finished, the very name self-determination will stink in one's nostrils. Already signs are not wanting to show that the Arabs, the Thracians and the Smyrnans are resenting their disposal. They may not like Turkish rule, but they like the present arrangement less. They could have made their own honourable terms with Turkey but these self-determining people will now be held down by the 'matchless might' of the allied *i. e.*, British forces. Britain had the straight course open to her of keeping the Turkish Empire intact and taking sufficient guarantees for good government. But her Prime Minister chose

the crooked course of secret treaties, duplicity and hypocritical subterfuges.

There is still a way out. Let her treat India as a real partner. Let her call the true representatives of the Mussalmans. Let them go to Arabia and the other parts of the Turkish Empire and let her devise a scheme in concert with them—a scheme that would not humiliate Turkey, that would satisfy the just Muslim sentiment and that will secure honest self-determination for the races composing that Empire. If it was Canada, Australia or South Africa that had to be placated, Mr. Lloyd George would not have dared to ignore them. They have the power to secede. India has not. Let him no more insult India by calling her a partner, if her feelings count for naught. I invite the *Times of India* to reconsider its position and join an honourable agitation in which a high-souled people are seeking nothing but justice.

I do with all deference still suggest that the least that Lord Chelmsford can do is to resign if the sacred feelings of India's sons are not to be consulted and respected by the Ministers. The *Times* is over-taxing the constitution when it suggests that as a constitutional Viceroy it is not open to Lord Chelmsford to go against the decisions of His Majesty's Ministers. It is certainly not open to a Viceroy to retain office and oppose ministerial decisions. But the constitution does allow a Viceroy to resign his high office when he is called upon to carry out decisions that are immoral as the peace terms are, or like these terms, are calculated to stir to their very depth the feelings of those whose affairs he is administering for the time being.

THE MUSSALMAN REPRESENTATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 30, 1920.*)

Slowly but surely the Mussalmans are preparing for the battle before them. They have to fight against odds that are undoubtedly heavy but not half as heavy as the Prophet had against him. How often did he not put his life in danger? But his faith in God was unquenchable. He went forward with a light heart, for God was on his side, for he represented truth. If his followers have half the Prophet's faith and half his spirit of sacrifice, the odds will be presently even and will in little while turn against the despoilers of Turkey. Already the rapacity of the Allies is telling against themselves. France finds her task difficult. Greece cannot stomach her ill-gotten gains. And England finds Mesopotamia a tough job. The oil of Mosul may feed the fire she has so wantonly lighted and burn her fingers badly. The newspapers say the Arabs do not like the presence of the Indian soldiery in their midst. I do not wonder. They are a fierce and brave people and do not understand why Indian soldiers should find themselves in Mesopotamia. Whatever the fate of non-co-operation, I wish that not a single Indian will offer his services for Mesopotamia whether for the civil or the military department. We must learn to think for ourselves and before entering upon any employment, find out whether thereby we may not make ourselves instruments of injustice. Apart from the question of Khilafat and from the point of abstract justice, the English have no right to hold Mesopotamia. It is no

part of our loyalty to help the Imperial Government in what is in plain language daylight robbery. If therefore we seek civil or military employment in Mesopotamia, we do so for the sake of earning a livelihood. It is our duty to see that the source is not tainted.

It surprises me to find so many people shirking over the very mention of non-co-operation. There is no instrument so clean, so harmless and yet so effective as non-co-operation. Judiciously hauled it need not produce any evil consequences. And its intensity will depend purely on the capacity of the people for sacrifice.

The chief thing is to prepare the atmosphere of non-co-operation. "We are not going to co-operate with you in your injustice," is surely the right and the duty of every intelligent subject to say. Were it not for our utter servility, helplessness and want of confidence in ourselves, we would certainly grasp this clean weapon and make the most effective use of it. Even the most despotic government cannot stand except for the consent of the governed which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. Immediately the subject ceases to fear the despotic force, his power is gone. But the British Government is never and nowhere entirely or even chiefly laid upon force. It does make an honest attempt to secure the good will of the governed. But it does not hesitate to adopt unscrupulous means to compel the consent of the governed. It has not gone beyond the 'honesty is the best policy' idea. It therefore bribes you into consenting to its will by awarding titles, medals and ribbons, by giving you employment, by its superior financial ability to open for its employees avenues for enriching themselves

and finally when these fail, it resorts to force. That is what Sir Michael O'Dwyer did and that is almost every British administrator will certainly do if he thought it necessary. If then we would not be greedy, if we would not run after titles and medals and honorary posts which do the country no good, half the battle is won.

My advisers are never tired of telling me that even if the Turkish peace terms are revised it will not be due to non-co-operation. I venture to suggest to them that non-co-operation has a higher purpose than mere revision of the terms. If I cannot compel revision, I must at least cease to support a government that becomes party to the usurpation. And if I succeed in pushing non-co-operation to the extreme limit, I do compel the Government to choose between India and the usurpation. I have faith enough in England to know that at that moment England will expel her present jaded ministers and put in others who will make a clean sweep of the terms in consultation with an awakened India, draft terms that will be honourable to her, to Turkey and acceptable to India.

But I hear my critics say "India has not the strength of purpose and the capacity for the sacrifice to achieve such a noble end." They are partly right. India has not these qualities now, because we have not—shall we not evolve them and infect the nation with them? Is not the attempt worth making? Is any sacrifice too great to gain such a great purpose?

BRITISH IMPERIALISM

(June 30, 1920.)

If the belief that the Turkish peace terms were inspired by the imperialistic ambitions of the Allies required further justification, it has amply been provided by the events and revelations of the past few months. The lure of oil, the greed of conquest, occupation and expansion of territory and of controlling the land and sea routes have proved too strong for the Big Three. Their vision has dimmed. They have set at naught their traditions, their principles, pledges and promises. It is a sad and painful tragedy of this war. But the saddest and the most painful of all is the revelation that England's statesmen who were the loudest in their cry of 'war for justice, liberty and right' have been the first to fall victim to the policy of grab. They have been shown to be the prime movers of it. The exposures made by some of the statesmen and journals of the rival Allies, France and Italy, show that from first to last, the Prime Minister of England, with his little band of Imperialists, has advocated the policy of disintegration and spoliation of Turkey. He is reported to be the mover of the plan of driving the Sultan away from Stamboul. His troops mainly occupy it to-day. The transfer of the rich and renowned lands of Thrace to his vassal Greece is attributed to him. The rich mineral fields of Asia Minor are under his mandatory. He is laying his hold on Persia and dreaming of land-routes, connecting his little Kingdom with its vast Eastern possessions. If beyond those glaring facts, any more evidence

is required of his rapacity, it is supplied by one of the Big Three, Signor Nitti, who in an interview to the Associated Press published by the French official organ, *La Temps* and reproduced by the *Manchester Guardian* as to his view of the treaty, is reported to have said :—

“ War in Asia Minor would be the result and for this war neither one soldier, nor one lira would be provided by Italy. . . . You have taken from the Turks their holy city, Adrianople. You have placed their capital under foreign control. You have taken all their ports and the greater part of their territory. The five delegates, chosen by you, will sign a treaty which will have the sanction neither of the Turkish people nor of the Turkish Government. ”

La Temps itself asserts that the Italian Government have been consistently following this policy and that they are prepared to abandon the ‘Concert of Nations’ when concerted action would alone ensure the application of the treaty. This gives a clue to the attitude of the Italian Government. The attitude of the Italian people is even stronger as seen from various Italian journals, the *Idea Nazionale* and the *Giornale d’ Italia*. The latter warns the people of a new holy war for the peace terms amount to decapitation of the Mussalman world. The paper declares that the peace terms will result in the complete realisation of British hegemony in the Near East both direct and, by means of her vassal Greece, indirect.

It is clear from the above that neither the Italian Premier—one of the Big Three—nor the Italian people are willing party to the peace terms. They have

been weak enough to submit to the terms but they openly dissociate themselves from any responsibilities. There then remain the French and British Governments and peoples. From the telegrams and other despatches received from Mohamad Ali we have learnt that the French attitude, both official and non-official, is more sympathetic towards the Muslim aspirations than the British. This is also clear from the opinion of a number of prominent French journals, publicists and statesmen. As to how they view the treaty, the following extract from Mr. Paul Louis' letter to the *L' Humanite* will explain:—

In the east of Europe British Imperialism is satisfying all its ambitions. It has reduced Turkey to an enclave in the midst of States which will be its vassals or of regions which it will itself govern. It will have the oil of Mosul, and will control, by its indirect hold of Batum, the oil of Baku. It occupies Constantinople. Even better, by putting the Greeks in Adrianople and bestowing innumerable presents upon Venizelos, it prepares the re-establishment of the Byzantine Empire in favour of Hellenism, and makes of that enriched Hellenism one of its most valuable auxiliaries in the East. It will use it against Turkish nationalism, and eventually against Russia. *The shadow of England covers the world.*

At the time of French occupation of the Rhine region when France was being charged by the British press and statesmen including Mr. Lloyd George for entertaining annexationist ideas, the French journal, *La Temps*, denying the aspersions retorted as follows:—

With his customary finesse, Mr. Lloyd George will no

doubt understand that in the interest of the Franco-British Alliance it is better that no English, and especially Welsh, voice should hurl the accusation of Imperialism at any Frenchman, were he even a journalist. Such accusations are missiles which rebound...Although the British Empire is growing enormously, we do not presume to declare that England is ruled by a powerful group of Imperialists...We do not even suspect that our friends across the Channel invented the strange argument propounded by a French journal in justification of their expansion: Britain now requires land-routes to connect the various parts of its Empire and that it is entitled to *lay hold on Persia, for instance.

What is the lesson that even the most favourably inclined person draws from all this? It is that the British Imperialism under the leadership of Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Milner and Mr. Churchill is chiefly, if not wholly, responsible for the Turkish peace terms such as they are.

Then again the *Daily Mail* report about France taking the initiative in revision of the treaty strengthens this opinion. The report has been contradicted but the contradiction is itself a confirmation of the view that France desires a revision. Here is the contradiction:—

It is authoritatively stated in Paris that the *Daily Mail* report is erroneous.....*While France desires in every way to facilitate Turkey in order to ensure the carrying out of the terms of the peace treaty, she cannot take the initiative for revision of the treaty before the treaty is signed. (Italics ours).*

It cannot be said after this that the British Government has been defeated by the Supreme Council. It is

rather the other way. The sacred trust imposed in England of Hampdon, Macaulay, Ruskin, Carlyle and Gladstone by a nation of 315 million people is being wantonly betrayed by a clique of Imperialists which rules her destinies to-day. The shadow of British Imperialism covers the world. It will be an evil day for England when her great democracy will have wholly surrendered itself to the greed of a few grabbers.

THE MAHOMEDAN DECISION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 9, 1920.)

The Khilafat meeting at Allahabad has unanimously reaffirmed the principle of non-co-operation and appointed an executive committee to lay down and enforce a detailed programme. This meeting was preceded by a joint Hindu-Mahomedan meeting at which Hindu leaders were invited to give their views. Mrs. Besant, the Hon'ble Pandit Malaviyaji, the Hon'bles Dr. Sapru, Motilal Nehru, Chintamani and others were present at the meeting. It was a wise step on the part of the Khilafat Committee to invite Hindus representing all shades of thought to give them the benefit of their advice. Mrs. Besant and Dr. Sapru strongly dissuaded the Mahomedans present from the policy of non-co-operation. The other Hindu speakers made non-committal speeches. Whilst the other Hindu speakers approved of the principle of non-co-operation in theory, they saw

many practical difficulties and they feared also complications arising from Mahomedans welcoming an Afghan invasion of India. The Mahomedan speakers gave the fullest and frankest assurances that they would fight to a man any invader who wanted to conquer India, but they were equally frank in asserting that any invasion from without undertaken with a view to uphold the prestige of Islam and to vindicate justice would have their full sympathy if not their actual support. It is easy enough to understand and justify the Hindu caution. It is difficult to resist the Mahomedan position. In my opinion, the best way to prevent India from becoming the battle ground between the forces of Islam and those of the English is for Hindus to make non-co-operation a complete and immediate success, and I have little doubt that if the Mahomedans remain true to their declared intention and are able to exercise self-restraint, and make sacrifices, the Hindus will "play the game" and join them in the campaign of non-co-operation. I feel equally certain that the Hindus will not assist Mahomedans in promoting or bringing about an armed conflict between the British Government and their allies, and Afghanistan. British forces are too well organised to admit of any successful invasion of the Indian frontier. The only way, therefore, the Mahomedans can carry on an effective struggle on behalf of the honour of Islam is to take up non-co-operation in real earnest. It will not only be completely effective if it is adopted by the people on an extensive scale, but it will also provide full scope for individual conscience. If I cannot bear an injustice done by an individual or a corporation, and if I am directly or indirect-

ly instrumental in upholding that individual or corporation, I must answer for it before my Maker; but I have done all it is humanly possible for me to do consistently with the moral code that refuses to injure even the wrong-doer, if I cease to support the injustice in the manner described above. In applying therefore such a great force there should be no haste, there should be no temper shown. Non-co-operation must be and remain absolutely a voluntary effort. The whole thing, then, depends upon Mahomedans themselves. If they will but help themselves, Hindu help will come and the Government, great and mighty though it is, will have to bend before this irresistible force. No Government can possibly withstand the bloodless opposition of a whole nation.

MR. MONTAGU ON THE KHILAFAT AGITATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1920.)

Mr. Montagu does not like the Khilafat agitation that is daily gathering force. In answer to questions put in the House of Commons, he is reported to have said that, whilst he acknowledged that I had rendered distinguished services to the country in the past, he could not look upon my present attitude with equanimity and that it was not to be expected that I could now be treated as leniently as I was during the Rowlatt Act agitation. He added that he had every confidence in the central and the local Governments, that they were carefully

watching the movement and that they had full power to deal with the situation.

This statement of Mr. Montagu has been regarded in some quarters as a threat. It has even been considered to be a blank cheque for the Government of India to reestablish the reign of terror if they chose. It is certainly inconsistent with his desire to base the government on the goodwill of the people. At the same time if the Hunter Committee's finding be true and if I was the cause of the disturbances last year, I was undoubtedly treated with exceptional leniency. I admit too that my activity this year is fraught with greater peril to the Empire as it is being conducted to-day than was last year's activity. Non-co-operation in itself is more harmless than civil disobedience, but in its effect it is far more dangerous for the Government than civil disobedience. Non-co-operation is intended so far to paralyse the Government as to compel justice from it. If it is carried to the extreme point, it can bring the Government to a standstill.

A friend who has been listening to my speeches once asked me whether I did not come under the sedition section of the Indian Penal Code. Though I had not fully considered it, I told him that very probably I did and that I could not plead 'not guilty' if I was charged under it. For I must admit that I can pretend to no 'affection' for the present Government. And my speeches are intended to create 'disaffection' such that the people might consider it a shame to assist or co-operate with a Government that had forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support.

I draw no distinction between the Imperial and the

Indian Government. The latter has accepted, on the Khilafat, the policy imposed upon it by the former. And in the Punjab case the former has endorsed the policy of terrorism and emasculation of a brave people initiated by the latter. British ministers have broken their pledged word and wantonly wounded the feelings of the seventy million Mussalmans of India. Innocent men and women were insulted by the insolent officers of the Punjab Government. Their wrongs not only remain unrighted, but the very officers who so cruelly subjected them to barbarous humiliation retain office under the Government.

When at Amritsar last year I pleaded with all the earnestness I could command for co-operation with the Government and for response to the wishes expressed in the Royal Proclamation, I did so because I honestly believed that a new era was about to begin, and that the old spirit of fear, distrust and consequent terrorism was about to give place to the new spirit of respect, trust and goodwill. I sincerely believed that the Mussalman sentiment would be placated and that the officers that had misbehaved during the Martial Law regime in the Punjab would be at least dismissed and the people would be otherwise made to feel that a Government that had always been found quick (and rightly) to punish popular excesses would not fail to punish its agents' misdeeds. But to my amazement and dismay I have discovered that the present representatives of the Empire have become dishonest and unscrupulous. They have no real regard for the wishes of the people of India and they count Indian honour as of little consequence.

I can no longer retain affection for a Government so evilly manned as it is now-a-days. And for me, it is humiliating to retain my freedom and be witness to the continuing wrong. Mr. Montagu however is certainly right in threatening me with deprivation of my liberty if I persist in endangering the existence of the Government. For that must be the result if my activity bears fruit. My only regret is that inasmuch as Mr. Montagu admits my past services, he might have perceived that there must be something exceptionally bad in the Government if a well-wisher like me could no longer give his affection to it. It was simpler to insist on justice being done to the Mussalmans and to the Punjab than to threaten me with punishment so that the injustice might be perpetuated. Indeed I fully expect it will be found that even in promoting disaffection towards an unjust Government, I had rendered greater services to the Empire than I am already credited with.

At the present moment, however, the duty of those who approve of my activity is clear. They ought on no account to resent the deprivation of my liberty, should the Government of India deem it to be their duty to take it away. A citizen has no right to resist such restriction imposed in accordance with the laws of the State to which he belongs. Much less have those who sympathise with him. In my case there can be no question of sympathy. For I deliberately oppose the Government to the extent of trying to put its very existence in jeopardy. For my supporters, therefore, it must be a moment of joy when I am imprisoned. It means the beginning of success if only the supporters continue the policy for which I

stand. If the Government arrest me, they would do so in order to stop the progress of non-co-operation which I preach. It follows that if non-co-operation continues with unabated vigour, even after my arrest, the Government must imprison others or grant the people's wish in order to gain their co-operation. Any eruption of violence on the part of the people even under provocation would end in disaster. Whether therefore it is I or any one else who is arrested during the campaign, the first condition of success is that there must be no resentment shown against it. We cannot imperil the very existence of a Government and quarrel with its attempt to save itself by punishing those who place it in danger.

THE KHILAFAT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 23, 1921.)

The proposed change in the Treaty of Sevres* cannot satisfy Indian Muslims. And that is saying a great deal. It is not Turkey merely that Great Britain has to placate. It is India that has to be pacified. In my opinion, if the demands of the Muslims of India are conceded, it will not much matter whether Turkey's are satisfied or not. And this for two reasons. The Khilafat is an ideal and when a man works for an ideal, he becomes irresistible. The Muslims, who represent the ideal, have behind them the opinion of the whole mass of the Indian people.

* The proposal was that Turkey should retain Asia Minor, including Smyrna, with only Constantinople in Europe.

It is wrong to say that Muslims are fighting merely for Turkey. They will abandon her to day, if she went wrong, if, to take a foolish illustration, she demands her restoration to the status that she occupied during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent. Similarly, the Muslims cannot abandon a claim based on the Koranic injunctions, because a weak and helpless Turkey cannot sustain it.

Whilst every good Muslim must strive to retain the temporal power of Turkey, it is obligatory on him to see that unequivocal Muslim control is retained over the 'Island of Arabia' which include Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine as well, and the spiritual sovereignty over them of the Caliph whoever he may be for the time being. No other terms, however good otherwise they may be, can possibly satisfy Muslim opinion. They will not tolerate any non-Muslim influence direct or indirect over the holy places of Islam.

The most thorny part of the question is, therefore, Palestine. Britain has made promises to the Zionists. The latter have, naturally, a sacred sentiment about the place. The Jews, it is contended, must remain a homeless wandering race unless they have obtained possession of Palestine. I do not propose to examine the soundness or otherwise of the doctrine underlying the proposition. All I contend is that they cannot possess Palestine through a trick or a moral breach. Palestine was not a stake in the war. The British Government could not dare have asked a single Muslim soldier to wrest control of Palestine from fellow-Muslims and give it to the Jews. Palestine, as a place of Jewish worship,

is a sentiment to be respected, and the Jews would have a just cause of complaint against Mussalman idealists if they were to prevent Jews from offering worship as freely as themselves.

By no canon of ethics or war, therefore, can Palestine be given to the Jews as a result of the war. Either Zionists must revise their ideal about Palestine, or, if Judaism permits the arbitrament of war, engage in a 'holy war' with the Muslims of the world with the Christians throwing in their influence on their side. But one may hope that the trend of world opinion will make 'holy wars' impossible and religious questions or differences will tend more and more towards a peaceful adjustment based upon the strictest moral considerations. But, whether such a happy time ever comes or not, it is clear as day-light that the Khilafat terms to be just must mean the restitution of Jazirut-ul-Arab to complete Muslim control under the spiritual sovereignty of the Caliph.

PART IV

Non-Co-operation

THE FIRST OF AUGUST

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1920.)

It is hardly likely that before the 1st of August there will be on the part of His Majesty's Ministers promise of a revision of the peace terms and the consequent suspension of the inauguration of Non-co-operation. The first of August next will be as important an event in the history of India as was the 6th of April last year. The sixth of April marked the beginning of the end of the Rowlatt Act. No one can consider the Rowlatt Act can possibly live in the face of the agitation that has only been suspended—never given up. It must be clear to anyone that the power that wrests justice from an unwilling Government in the matter of the Punjab and the Khilafat will be the power that will secure repeal of the Rowlatt Act. And that power is the power of Satyagraha, whether it is known by the name of Civil Disobedience or Non-co-operation.

Many people dread the advent of Non-co-operation, because of the events of last year. They fear madness from the mob and consequent repetition of last year's reprisals almost unsurpassed in their ferocity in the

history of modern times. 'Personally I do not mind Governmental fury as I mind mob fury. The latter is a sign of national distemper and therefore more difficult to deal with than the former which is confined to a small corporation. It is easier to oust a Government that has rendered itself unfit to govern than it is to cure unknown people in a mob of their madness. But great movements cannot be stopped altogether because a Government or a people or both go wrong. We learn and profit through our mistakes and failures. No general worth the name gives up a battle because he has suffered reverses, or which is the same thing, made mistakes. And so we must approach Non-co-operation with confidence and hope.) As in the past, the commencement is to be marked by fasting and prayer, a sign of the religious character of the demonstration. There should also be on that day suspension of business, and meetings to pass resolutions praying for revision of the peace terms and justice for the Punjab and inculcating Non-co-operation until justice has been done.

The giving up of titles and honorary posts should also commence from the first of August. Doubt has been expressed as to the sufficiency of notice regarding surrender of titles and honorary posts. It is however quickly dispelled by bearing in mind that the first August marks the commencement of the surrender of titles. It is not the only day on which surrender has to take place. Indeed I do not expect a very large response on the first day. A vigorous propaganda will have to be carried on and the message delivered to every title or post holder and the argument presented to him proving the duty of such surrender.

But the greatest thing in this campaign of Non-co-operation is to evolve order, discipline, co-operation among the people, co-ordination among the workers. Effective Non-co-operation depends upon complete organisation. Thousands of men who have filled meetings throughout the Punjab have convinced me that the people want to withdraw co-operation from the Government but they must know how. Most people do not understand the complicated machinery of the Government. They do not realise that every citizen silently but nonetheless certainly sustains the government of the day in ways of which he has no knowledge. Every citizen therefore renders himself responsible for every act of his government. And it is quite proper to support it so long as the actions of the government are bearable. But when they hurt him and his nation, it becomes his duty to withdraw his support.

But as I have said, every citizen does not know how to do so in an orderly manner. Disorderliness comes from anger, orderliness out of intelligent resistance. The first condition therefore of real success is to ensure entire absence of violence. Violence done to persons representing the Government or to persons who don't join our ranks, *i.e.*, the supporters of the Government, means in every case retrogression in our case, cessation of Non-co-operation and useless waste of innocent lives. Those therefore who wish to make Non-co-operation a success in the quickest possible time will consider it their first duty to see that in their neighbourhood complete order is kept.

LETTER TO THE VICEROY

(August 4, 1920.)

[Mr. Gandhi addressed the following letter to the Viceroy on August 1, 1920, on the occasion of the inauguration of the N.C.O. movement.]

It is not without a pang that I return the Kaisar-i-Hind gold medal granted to me by your predecessor for my humanitarian work in South Africa, the Zulu war medal granted in South Africa for my services as officer in charge of the Indian Volunteer Ambulance Corps in 1906 and the Boer War medal for my services as assistant superintendent of the Indian Volunteer Stretcher Bearer Corps during the Boer War of 1899-1900. I venture to return these medals in pursuance of the scheme of Non-co-operation inaugurated to-day in connection with the Khilafat movement. Valuable as these honours have been to me, I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussalman countrymen have to labour under a wrong done to their religious sentiment. Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral and unjust manner and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality. I can retain neither respect nor affection for such a Government.)

The attitude of the Imperial and Your Excellency's Governments on the Punjab question has given me additional cause for grave dissatisfaction. I had the honour, as Your Excellency is aware, as one of the Congress Commissioners, to investigate the causes of the disorders

in the Punjab during the April of 1919. And it is my deliberate conviction that Sir Michael O'Dwyer was totally unfit to hold the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab and that his policy was primarily responsible for infuriating the mob at Amritsar. No doubt the mob excesses were unpardonable ; incendiarism, murder of five innocent Englishmen and the cowardly assault on Miss Sherwood were most deplorable and uncalled for. But the punitive measures taken by General Dyer, Col. Frank Johnson, Col. O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Shri Ram Sud, Mr. Malik Khan and other officers were out of all proportion to the crime of the people and amounted to wanton cruelty and inhumanity almost unparalleled in modern times. Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of the official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu's dispatch and above all the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and callous disregard of the feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords, have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government and have disabled me from tendering, as I have hitherto whole-heartedly tendered, my loyal co-operation.

In my humble opinion the ordinary method of agitating by way of petitions, deputations and the like is no remedy for moving to repentance a Government so hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved to be. In European countries, condonation of such grievous wrongs as the Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in a bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted at

all cost national emasculation such as the said wrongs imply. But half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have therefore ventured to suggest the remedy of non-co-operation which enables those who wish, to dissociate themselves from the Government and which, if it is unattended by violence and undertaken in an ordered manner, must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed. But whilst I shall pursue the policy of non-co-operation in so far as I can carry the people with me, I shall not lose hope that you will yet see your way to do justice. I therefore respectfully ask Your Excellency to summon a conference of the recognised leaders of the people and in consultation with them, find a way that would placate the Mussalmans and do reparation to the unhappy Punjab.

NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 28, 1920.)

A writer in the *Times of India*, the editor of that wonderful daily and Mrs. Besant have all in their own manner condemned non-co-operation conceived in connection with the Khilafat movement. All the three writings naturally discuss many side-issues which I shall omit for the time being. I propose to answer two serious objections raised by the writers. The sobriety with which they are stated entitles them to a greater consideration than if they had been given in violent language. In non-

co-operation, the writers think, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to avoid violence. Indeed violence, the *Times of India* editorial says, has already commenced in that ostracism has been resorted to in Calcutta and Delhi. Now I fear that ostracism to a certain extent is impossible to avoid. I remember in South Africa in the initial stages of the passive resistance campaign those who had fallen away were ostracised. Ostracism is violent or peaceful in according to the manner in which it is practised. A congregation may well refuse to recite prayers after a priest who prizes his title above his honour. But the ostracism will become violent if the individual life of a person is made unbearable by insults, innuendoes or abuse. The real danger of violence lies in the people resorting to non-co-operation becoming impatient and revengeful. This may happen, if, for instance, payment of taxes is suddenly withdrawn or if pressure is put upon soldiers to lay down their arms. I however do not fear any evil consequences, for the simple reason that every responsible Mahomedan understands that non-co-operation to be successful must be totally unattended with violence. The other objection raised is that those who may give up their service may have to starve. That is just a possibility but a remote one, for the committee will certainly make due provision for those who may suddenly find themselves out of employment. I propose however to examine the whole of the difficult question much more fully in a future issue and hope to show that if Indian Mahomedan feeling is to be respected, there is nothing left but non-co-operation if the decision arrived at is adverse.

HOW TO WORK NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*May 5, 1921.*)

Perhaps the best way of answering the fears and criticism as to non-co-operation is to elaborate more fully the scheme of non-co-operation. The critics seem to imagine that the organisers propose to give effect to the whole scheme at once. The fact however is that the organisers have fixed definite, progressive four stages. The first is the giving up of titles and resignation of honourary posts. If there is no response or if the response received is not effective, recourse will be had to the second stage. The second stage involves much previous arrangement. Certainly not a single servant will be called out unless he is either capable of supporting himself and his dependants or the Khilafat Committee is able to bear the burden. All the classes of servants will not be called out at once and never will any pressure be put upon a single servant to withdraw himself from the Government service. Nor will a single private employee be touched for the simple reason that the movement is not anti-English. It is not even anti-Government. Co-operation is to be withdrawn because the people must not be party to a wrong—a broken pledge—a violation of deep religious sentiment. Naturally, the movement will receive a check, If there is any undue influence brought to bear upon any Government servant or if any violence is used or countenanced by any member of the Khilafat Committee. The second stage must be entirely successful, if the

response is at all on an adequate scale. For no Government—much less the Indian Government—can subsist if the people cease to serve it. The withdrawal therefore of the police and the military—the third stage—is a distant goal. The organisers however wanted to be fair, open and above suspicion. They did not want to keep back from the Government or the public a single step they had in contemplation even as a remote contingency. The fourth *i. e.*, suspension of taxes is still more remote. The organisers recognise that suspension of general taxation is fraught with the greatest danger. It is likely to bring a sensitive class in conflict with the police. They are therefore not likely to embark upon it, unless they can do so with the assurance that there will be no violence offered by the people.

I admit as I have already done that non-co-operation is not unattended with risk, but the risk of supineness in the face of a grave issue is infinitely greater than the danger of violence ensuing from organising non-co-operation. To do nothing is to invite violence for a certainty.

It is easy enough to pass resolutions or write articles condemning non-co-operation. But it is no easy task to restrain the fury of a people incensed by a deep sense of wrong. I urge those who talk or work against non-co-operation to descend from their chairs and go down to the people, learn their feelings and write, if they have the heart, against non-co-operation. They will find, as I have found, that the only way to avoid violence is to enable them to give such expression to their feelings as to compel redress. I have found nothing save non-co-opera-

tion. It is logical and harmless. It is the inherent right of a subject to refuse to assist a government that will not listen to him.

Non-co-operation as a voluntary movement can only succeed, if the feeling is genuine and strong enough to make people suffer to the utmost. If the religious sentiment of the Mahomedans is deeply hurt and if the Hindus entertain neighbourly regard towards their Muslim brethren, they will both count no cost too great for achieving the end. Non-co-operation will not only be an effective remedy but will also be an effective test of the sincerity of the Muslim claim and the Hindu profession of friendship.

There is however one formidable argument urged by friends against my joining the Khilafat movement. They say that it ill becomes me, a friend of the English and an admirer of the British constitution, to join hands with those who are to-day filled with nothing but ill-will against the English. I am sorry to have to confess that the ordinary Mahomedan entertains to-day no affection for Englishmen. He considers, not without some cause, that they have not played the game. But if I am friendly towards Englishmen, I am no less so towards my countrymen, the Mahomedans. And as such they have a greater claim upon my attention than Englishmen. My personal religion however enables me to serve my countrymen without hurting Englishmen or for that matter, anybody else. (What I am not prepared to do to my blood-brother I would not do to an Englishman.) I would not injure him to gain a kingdom. But I would withdraw co-ope-

ration from him if it became necessary, as I had withdrawn from my own brother (now deceased) when it became necessary. I serve the Empire by refusing to partake in its wrong. William Stead offered public prayers for British reverses at the time of the Boer war because he considered that the nation to which he belonged was engaged in an unrighteous war. The present Prime Minister risked his life in opposing that war and did everything he could to obstruct his own Government in its prosecution. And to-day if I have thrown in my lot with the Mahomedans a large number of whom bear no friendly feelings towards the British, I have done so frankly as a friend of the British and with the object of gaining justice and of thereby showing the capacity of the British constitution to respond to every honest determination when it is coupled with suffering. I hope by my 'alliance' with the Mahomedans to achieve a threefold end—to obtain justice in the face of odds with the method of Satyagrah and to show its efficacy over all other methods, to secure Mahomedan friendship for the Hindus and thereby internal peace also, and last but not least to transform ill-will into affection for the British and their constitution which in spite of its imperfections has weathered many a storm.√ I may fail in achieving any of the ends. I can but attempt; God alone can grant success. It will not be denied that the ends are all worthy.) I invite Hindus and Englishmen to join me in a full-hearted manner in shouldering the burden the Mahomedans of India are carrying. Theirs is admittedly a just fight. The Viceroy, the Secretary of State, the Maharaja of Bikaner and Lord Sinha have testified to it. Time has arrived to

make good the testimony. People with a just cause are never satisfied with a mere protest. They have been known to die for it. Are a high-spirited people like the Mahomedans expected to do less?

THE NON-CO-OPERATION COMMITTEE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 23, 1920.)

There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding and misconception about the non-co-operation committee appointed by the Khilafat Committee at Allahabad on the 3rd instant. A friend who was present at the meeting writes to say that the committee was formed for the purpose of giving full effect to non-co-operation and to act in all matters in connection with it as if it was representative of the whole Mussalman population of India even in the matter of making representations to the authorities. That this was not the committee's scope is the purpose of this writing to show.

As I stated its objects when I invited the formation of the committee, they were to ascertain and enforce the wish of the nation on non-co-operation. Whilst it is a representative body with full powers to act, it cannot be said—it is not intended—to represent all the best and the most influential Mahomedan opinion. It does not for instance represent the titled nobility in Islam. It is no fault in the committee. It has been purposely restricted to those who are able to give their whole time and attention to the work of organising non-co-operation and in the

process of ensuring obedience to instructions, other discipline and non-violence. It is therefore a committee of workers. It is not expected that the whole of the Mussalman India will be equally strong in non-co-operation. Some doubt its efficacy, others consider it to be a milk and water remedy, some dread it as being too strong for India in her present stage, they say she has not developed the measure of sacrifice at present to ensure success. The committee does not represent or contain such doubting elements though they may otherwise be much more influential than many Mussalmans who are on the committee. It contains those only who have the largest faith in non-co-operation and who although they swear by it, yet will not force the pace to the breaking point but will endeavour to carry the nation with its programme in so far as it is practicable, and who whilst doing so will not themselves be deterred from taking the boldest steps and will seek out those who are prepared to do likewise. This committee, therefore, starting without any, has to build its reputation upon its work and upon results it may achieve. It will cease to exist if it shows no work or in spite of work shows no results. For outsiders it has the least representative capacity. Shaukat Ali is an amiable man but a rabid fanatic carrying no weight with anybody, Hasrat Mohani a useless man who thinks of nothing but swadeshi, Dr. Kitchlew a man of yesterday with no experience of the world outside Amritsar. Much the same may be said against the others. I am no doubt a superior person but after all a crank and an interloper at that. Any representation signed by it will carry little weight with the outside world in so far as it depends upon the

influence of the signatories. It does not therefore mean that it will never make representations. It certainly will, when swiftness is of the essence or when others for reasons of expediency or otherwise are not prepared to sign representations. Indeed canvassing of signatures to weighty representations will be one of the means of gauging public opinion and testing the spirit of sacrifice among the elite of the land. For the masses and for internal work, however, the committee is the most representative. It is difficult perhaps to find two men more representative of Mussalman opinion than Shaukat Ali and Hasrat Mohani. The others though less known have been chosen for the qualities of strength, perseverance, patience, calmness, truthfulness, courage under difficulty and sacrifice believed to be possessed by them.

It has been suggested that I am to lead the movement. The statement is only partially true. I say this not out of humility merely, but it is a literal fact. If the belief gains ground that I am leading the movement, it may prove fatal to it. I am leading the movement in the sense that I am the adviser whose advice is most acceptable to-day and who has the determination not surpassed by anybody to carry out the programme of non-co-operation. But I do not pretend to represent Mussalman opinion. I can only try to interpret it. I could not stand alone and expect to carry the Mussulman masses with me. I should be very properly hooted out by a mixed Mussalman audience if I tried to make a point against the best Mussalman opinion in matters of religion. But if I were a Mussalman, I would not mind contesting issues before a Mussalman meeting in the face of heavy

odds against me. I consider myself to be a sagacious worker and my sagacity means no more and no less than a fine perception of my limitations. I hope I never travel beyond my limits. Certainly I have never done so consciously. It is necessary for every intelligent Mussalman to bear in mind my limitations and the scope of my function. Ignorance is likely to prove fatal to the success of the movement. My connection with it must not stupefy workers into indolence or indifference. My connection should mean, if it is to be productive of good results, greater watchfulness, greater sense of responsibility, greater capacity and willingness for work and greater efficiency. I can think out plans but execution must ever rest with Mussalman workers. The movement must be worked and led by them with the assistance of friends like me but also without if need be. I must not be expected to make non-co-operators; Mussalman leaders alone can make them. No amount of sacrifice on my part will produce in the Mussalman world the spirit of non-co-operation *i. e.*, sacrifice in a matter of religion. The Mussalman leaders will have to show it in their own persons before the masses evolve it.

And now the question, why there are no Hindu leaders on the committee is easily answered. The supreme committee can only be purely Mussalman. My presence, too, I consider as an evil, but it is a necessary evil because of my qualifications. I have specialised in non-co-operation. I have successfully experimented with it. The resolution about non-co-operation was conceived by me at the conference at Delhi. I am on the committee therefore as a specialist and not because I am a Hindu.

My function is therefore of an adviser merely. That I happen to be a staunch Hindu with the conviction that every Hindu should consider it to be his duty to go with the Mussalmans the full length in non-co-operation, is no doubt an advantage to the committee. But that advantage was at its disposal whether I was on it or not.

Whilst I am considering the Hindu connection with the Khilafat movement, even at the risk of repetition, I would like to clear up my own position. As I consider the Muslim claim to be intrinsically (as distinguished from religiously) just, I propose to go with them to the extent of fullest non-co-operation. And I consider it to be perfectly consistent with my loyalty to the British connection. But I would not go with the Mussalmans in any campaign of violence. I could not help them in promoting, for instance, an invasion of India through Afghanistan or otherwise for the purpose of forcing better peace terms. It is, I hold, the duty of every Hindu to resist any inroad on India even for the purpose specified, as it is his duty to help his Mussalman brethren to satisfy their just demands by means of non-co-operation or other form of suffering, no matter how great, so long as it does not involve loss of India's liberty or inflicting of violence on any person. And I have thrown myself whole-heartedly into the non-co-operation movement if only because I want to prevent any such armed conflict.

MR. GANDHI'S SPEECH

(August 4, 1920.)

[Before a crowded meeting of Mussalmans in the Muzaffarabad at Bombay held on the 29th July, 1920, speaking on the impending Non-co-operation, which commenced on the 1st of August, Mr. Gandhi said .—]

(The time for speeches on Non-co-operation was past and the time for practice had arrived. But two things were needful for complete success, an environment free from any violence on the part of the people and a spirit of self-sacrifice. Non-co-operation, as the speaker had conceived it, was an impossibility in an atmosphere surcharged with the spirit of violence. Violence was an exhibition of anger and any such exhibition was dissipation of valuable energy. Subduing of one's anger was a storing up of national energy, which, when set free in an ordered manner, would produce astounding results. His conception of Non-co-operation did not involve rapine, plunder, incendiarism and all the concomitants of mass madness. His scheme presupposed ability on their part to control all the forces of evil. If, therefore, any disorderliness was found on the part of the people which they could not control, he for one would certainly help the Government to control them.) In the presence of disorder it would be for him a choice of evil, and evil though he considered the present Government to be, he would not hesitate for the time being to help the Government to control disorder. But he had faith in the people. He believed that they knew that the cause could only be won by non-violent methods. To put it at the lowest, the people had not the power, even if they had the will,

to resist with brute strength the unjust Governments of Europe who had, in the intoxication of their success, disregarding every canon of justice, dealt so cruelly by the only Islamic Power in Europe.

MATCHLESS WEAPON

(In non-co-operation they had a matchless and powerful weapon.) It was a sign of religious atrophy to sustain an unjust Government that supported an injustice by resorting to untruth and camouflage. So long therefore the Government did not purge itself of the canker of injustice and untruth, it was their duty to withdraw all help from it consistently with their ability to preserve order in the social structure. The first stage of non-co-operation was, therefore, arranged so as to involve minimum of danger to public peace and minimum of sacrifice on the part of those who participated in the movement. And if they might not help an evil Government nor receive any favours from it, it followed that they must give up all titles of honour which were no longer a proud possession. Lawyers, who were in reality honorary officers of the court, should cease to support courts that upheld the prestige of an unjust Government and the people must be able to settle their disputes and quarrels by private arbitration. Similarly parents should withdraw their children from the public schools and they must evolve a system of national education or private education totally independent of the Government. An insolent Government conscious of its brute strength, might laugh at such withdrawals by the people especially as the law courts and schools were supposed to help the people, but he had not

a shadow of doubt that the moral effect of such a step could not possibly be lost even upon a Government whose conscience had become stifled by the intoxication of power.

SWADESHI

He had hesitation in accepting Swadeshi as a plank in non-co-operation. To him Swadeshi was as dear as life itself. But he had no desire to smuggle in Swadeshi through the Khilafat movement, if it could not legitimately help that movement. But conceived as non-co-operation was in a spirit of self-sacrifice, Swadeshi had a legitimate place in the movement. Pure Swadeshi meant sacrifice of one's liking for fineries. He asked the nation to sacrifice its liking for the fineries of Europe and Japan and be satisfied with the coarse but beautiful fabrics woven on their handlooms out of yarn spun by millions of their sisters. If the nation had become really awakened to a sense of the danger to its religions and its self-respect, it could not but perceive the absolute and immediate necessity of the adoption of Swadeshi in its intense form and if the people of India adopted Swadeshi with the religious zeal he begged to assure them that its adoption would arm them with a new power and would produce an unmistakable impression throughout the whole world. He, therefore, expected the Mussalmans to give the lead by giving up all the fineries they were so fond of and adopt the simple cloth that could be produced by the manual labour of their sisters and brethren in their own cottages. And he hoped that the Hindus would follow suit. It was a sacrifice in which the whole nation, every man, woman and child could take part.

AT THE CALL OF THE COUNTRY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*July 21, 1920.*)

Dr. Sapru delivered before the Khilafat conference* at Allahabad an impassioned address sympathising with the Mussalmans in their trouble but dissuaded them from embarking on Non-co-operation. He was frankly unable to suggest a substitute but was emphatically of opinion that whether there was a substitute or not, Non-co-operation was a remedy worse than the disease. He said further that Mussalmans will be taking upon their shoulders a serious responsibility if, whilst they appealed to the ignorant masses to join them, they could not appeal to the Indian judges to resign and if they did, they would not succeed.)

I acknowledge the force of Dr. Sapru's last argument. At the back of Dr. Sapru's mind is the fear that Non-co-operation by the ignorant people would lead to distress and chaos and would do no good. In my opinion any Non-co-operation is bound to do some good. Even the Viceregal door-keeper saying, 'Please, Sir, I can serve the Government no longer because it has hurt my national honour' and resigning is a step mightier and more effective than the mightiest speech declaiming against the Government for its injustice.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to appeal to the door-keeper until one has appealed to the highest in the land.

* This Conference was convened for considering whether N. C. O. was the proper means for getting redress of the Khilafat wrong.

And as I propose, if the necessity arose, to ask the door-keepers of the Government to dissociate themselves from an unjust Government, I propose now to address an appeal to the Judges and the Executive Councillors to join the protest that is rising from all over India against the double wrong done to India, on the Khilafat and the Punjab questions. In both national honour is involved.

I take it that these gentlemen have entered upon their high offices not for the sake of emolument, nor I hope for the sake of fame, but for the sake of serving their country. It was not for money, for, they were earning more than they do now. It must not be for fame, for, they cannot buy fame at the cost of national honour. The only consideration that can at the present moment keep them in office must be service of the country.

When the people have faith in the government, when it represents the popular will, the judges and the executive officials possibly serve the country. But when that government does not represent the will of the people, when it supports dishonesty and terrorism, the judges and the executive officials by retaining office become instruments of dishonesty and terrorism. And the least therefore that these holders of high offices can do is to cease to become agents of a dishonest and terrorising government.

For the judges the objection will be raised that they are above politics, and so they are and should be. But the doctrine is true only in so far as the government is on the whole for the benefit of the people and at least represents the will of the majority. Not to take part in politics means not to take sides. But when a whole

country has one mind, one will, when a whole country has been denied justice, it is no longer a question of party politics, it is a matter of life and death. It then becomes the duty of every citizen to refuse to serve a government which misbehaves and flouts national wish. The judges are at that moment bound to follow the nation if they are ultimately its servants.

There remains another argument to be examined. It applies to both the judges and the members of the executive. It will be urged that my appeal could only be meant for the Indians and what good can it do by Indians renouncing offices which have been won for the nation by hard struggle. I wish that I could make an effective appeal to the English as well as the Indians. But I confess that I have written with the mental reservation that the appeal is addressed only to the Indians. I must therefore examine the argument just stated. Whilst it is true that these offices have been secured after a prolonged struggle, they are of use not because of the struggle but because they are intended to serve the nation. The moment they cease to possess that quality, they become useless and, as in the present case, harmful, no matter how hard-earned and therefore valuable they may have been at the outset.

I would submit too to our distinguished countrymen who occupy high offices, that their giving up their offices will bring the struggle to a speedy end and would probably obviate the danger attendant upon the masses being called upon to signify their disapproval by withdrawing co-operation. If the title-holders gave up their titles, if the holders of honorary offices gave up their appoint-

ments and if the high officials gave up their posts, and the would-be councillors boycotted the councils, the Government would quickly come to its senses and give effect to the people's will. For, the alternative before the Government then would be nothing but despotic rule pure and simple. That would probably mean military dictatorship. The world's opinion has advanced so far that Britain dare not contemplate such dictatorship with equanimity. The taking of the steps suggested by me will constitute the peace fullest revolution the world has ever seen. Once the infallibility of Non-co-operation is realised, there is an end to all bloodshed and violence in any shape or form.

Undoubtedly a cause must be grave to warrant the drastic method of national Non-co-operation.* I do say that the affront such as has been put upon Islam cannot be repeated for a century. Islam must rise now or 'be fallen' if not for ever, certainly for a century. And I cannot imagine a graver wrong than the massacre of Jallianwalla and the barbarity that followed it, the whitewash by the Hunter Committee, the dispatch of the Government of India, Mr. Montagu's letter upholding the Viceroy and the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, the refusal to remove officials who made of the lives of the Punjabis 'a hell' during the Martial Law period.) These acts constitute a complete series of continuing wrongs against India, which, if India has any sense of honour, she must right at the sacrifice of all the material wealth she possesses. If she does not, she will have bartered her soul for a 'mess of pottage.'

THE CONGRESS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*September 15, 1920.*)

Never has the Congress been called upon to decide an issue so momentous as the one it was called upon to decide at its special session presided over by Lala Lajpat Rai. Never perhaps has the Congress witnessed such determined opposition as was offered to the non-co-operation resolution. And yet never, within my experience, has a decisive majority listened with such respect and attention to the opposition argument as it did at the last session. Again never has there been such united opposition shown to a Subjects Committee resolution by the noted leaders of the people.

Mrs. Besant has a fine record of service to India. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is a name to conjure with. He has to his credit an unbroken record of many years' brilliant service to the country and an unblemished character. Mr. Das leads a party ever growing in influence and strength. I felt the late Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak's absence most keenly at such a juncture. Mr. Baptista led the Deccan. Mr. Kasturi Ranga Ayengar, the talented editor of the *Hindu*, led the Madras Nationalist party. All these and many other leaders strenuously opposed the non-co-operation resolution. I warned that great audience against accepting my proposal unless they were prepared to suffer and were convinced that true non-co-operation was possible only through the programme submitted by me. But the audience wanted

action, wanted suffering. The voting was elaborately registered. The Congress pandal was cleared for the purpose of voting. Lala Lajpat Rai personally superintended the operation. It lasted for six hours. All the provinces but the Central Provinces and the Berars voted in favour of my resolution. The Central Provinces gave for my proposition 30 votes as against 33 for Babu Bipin Chandra Pal's. I give the figures below.

	For Res.	For Amendment
Bombay	243	93
Madras	161	135
Bengal	551	395
U. P.	259	28
Punjab	254	92
Andhra	59	12
Sindh	36	16
Delhi	59	9
Behar	184	28
Burma	14	4
C. P.	30	33
Berars	5	28
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	1855	873

My resolution adopted the principle of the whole of the Khilafat programme, even non-payment of taxes, and advised, for immediate adoption, boycott of titles and honorary offices, law courts by litigants, schools and colleges and reformed councils. Babu Bipin Chandra Pal proposed a mission to England to present our demands and meanwhile to establish national schools, formulate arbitration courts and not to boycott the coun-

cils. His resolution would have meant in effect seeking election to the councils and these probably adopting obstructive tactics. This meant a virtual postponement of the real struggle to the next general election. The opposition therefore chiefly centred on the boycott of councils. And the Congress has decided by an overwhelming majority that the councils must be abandoned. I hope that those who do not believe that boycott of councils would postpone the attainment of Swarajya (let alone hastening it) will work with all their might to advance the purpose of the Congress.

An analysis of the votes shows that the country wants non-co-operation. Mrs. Besant who consistently, fearlessly and frankly opposed it, had very few adherents. I do not propose to examine the merits of the case at the present moment. My argument is before the country in favour of boycott of councils, schools and courts. Nothing I heard on the Congress platform has shaken my belief in the necessity or the efficacy of these steps. But I would respectfully address a few words to the majority and to the minority.

To the majority I would say: The hour of the greatest triumph is the hour of the greatest humility. The majority has taken upon its shoulders a tremendous responsibility. Every individual voter in favour of my proposal has certainly bound himself, if he is a parent, to withdraw his children from schools or colleges subject in any way to Government control. Every voter being a lawyer is bound at the earliest opportunity to suspend his practice and promote the cause of settlement of disputes by private arbitration.

Every candidate for the councils, who has voted with the majority, has undertaken to withdraw his candidature, every such voter to refrain from voting at the elections. Every delegate voting with the majority has bound himself to stimulate hand-spinning and hand-weaving and in his own person to use only hand-spun and hand-woven cloth. Every one of the majority having accepted the principle of non-violence, self-sacrifice and discipline in regard to non-co-operation is bound to treat the minority with respect and fairness. We may not use physical or wordy violence against them. We must endeavour by our intensive practice and by scrupulously honourable methods to convert it to our views. Those who voted with the minority were either weak or not ready. Some few doubted the rightness of withdrawing children from schools for instance. But when they see schools being emptied, national schools springing into being, lawyers suspending practice and yet not starving, and the councils deserted at least by the best of nationalists, they will soon begin to believe in the programme, loose their weakness and be themselves ready to adopt it. We need not therefore be impatient with the minority because it does not see eye to eye with us.

To the minority I would say, they have lost in a fair fight. Unless now therefore it is a matter of conscience with them, they must come forward to prosecute the programme of non-co-operation in a most vigorous manner. ✓ Those who think that the majority has grievously erred are no doubt entitled to carry on a campaign of conversion of the majority to their views. ✓ By far the largest number in the minority however have

accepted the principle of establishment of private arbitration courts and national schools. They wanted only a postponement of the consideration of the boycott of councils. I venture to suggest to them that now that the majority has decided in favour of a quicker pace, the minority should accept the verdict and help to make the programme a success.

Boycott of foreign goods finds a place in my resolution. I am sorry for it. I may not state how it came to find a place there. But as it did not conflict with my conscience, and in order to show my reasonableness, I undertook to move a resolution whose musical harmony was marred by a false note. Boycott of foreign cloth is included in Swadeshi. Boycott of all other foreign goods is a senseless proposition if only because it is a virtual impossibility. But if the introduction of the addendum stimulates us to sacrifice our luxuries and superfluities, it would have served a good purpose. It is certainly our right and duty to discard everything foreign that is superfluous and even everything foreign that is *necessary* if we can produce or manufacture it in our country.

MR. GANDHI'S CONGRESS SPEECH

(September 15, 1920.)

Mr. Gandhi moved his resolution on Non-co-operation* with the following speech :—

I am aware, more than aware, of the grave respon-

* The following is the resolution on N. C. O. moved by Mr. Gandhi —
In view of the fact that on the Khilafat question both the Indian and Imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Mussal-

sibility that rests on my shoulders in being privileged to move this resolution before this great assembly. I am aware that my difficulties, as also yours, increase if you are able to adopt this resolution. I am also aware that the adoption of my resolution will mark a definite change in the policy which the country has hitherto adopted for the vindication of the rights that belong to it, and its honour. I am aware that a large number of our leaders

maus of India, and the Prime Minister has deliberately broken his pledged word given to them and that it is the duty of every non-Moslem Indian in every legitimate manner to assist his Mussalman brother in his attempt to remove the religious calamity that has overtaken him :

And in view of the fact that in the matter of the events of the April of 1919, both the said Governments have grossly neglected or failed to protect the innocent people of the Punjab and punish officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviour towards them and have exonerated Sir Michael O'Dwyer who proved himself directly or indirectly responsible for the most of the official crimes and callous to the sufferings of the people placed under his administration, and that the debate in the House of Lords betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India and showed virtual support of the systematic terrorism and frightfulness adopted in the Punjab and that the latest Viceregal pronouncement is proof of entire absence of repentance in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab :

This Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of the two aforementioned wrongs and that the only effectual means to vindicate national honour and to prevent a repetition of similar wrongs in future is the establishment of Swarajya. This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent non-co-operation until the said wrongs are righted and Swarajya is established.

And inasmuch as a beginning should be made by the classes who have hitherto moulded and represented opinion and inasmuch as Government consolidates its power through titles and honours bestowed on the people, through schools controlled by it, its law courts and its legislative councils, and inasmuch as it is desirable in the prosecution of the movement to take the minimum risk and to call for the least sacrifice compatible with the attainment of the desired object, this Congress earnestly advises :—

who have given the time and attention to the affairs of my motherland, which I have not been able to give, are ranged against me. They think it a duty to resist the policy of revolutionising the Government policy at any

-
- (a) surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies ,
 - (b) refusal to attend Government Levees, Durbars, and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their honour ,
 - (c) gradual withdrawal of children from Schools and Colleges owned, aided or controlled by Government and in place of such schools and colleges establishment of National Schools and Colleges in the various Provinces ;
 - (d) gradual boycott of British Courts by lawyers and litigants and establishment of private arbitration courts by their aid for the settlement of private disputes ,
 - (e) refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia ,
 - (f) withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils and refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election ,
 - (g) The boycott of foreign goods ;

And inasmuch as non-co-operation has been conceived as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice without which no nation can make real progress, and inasmuch as an opportunity should be given in the very first stage of non-co-operation to every man, woman, and child, for such discipline and self-sacrifice, this Congress advises adoption of Swadeshi in piecegoods on a vast scale, and inasmuch as the existing mills of India with indigenous capital and control do not manufacture sufficient yarn and sufficient cloth for the requirements of the nation, and are not likely to do so for a long time to come, this Congress advises immediate stimulation of further manufacture on a large scale by means of reviving hand-spinning in every home and hand-weaving on the part of the millions of weavers who have abandoned their ancient and honourable calling for want of encouragement.

cost. Knowing that, I stand before you in fear of God and a sense of duty to put this before you for your hearty acceptance.

THINK IMPARTIALLY

I ask you to dismiss me, for the time being, from your consideration. I have been charged of saintliness and a desire for dictatorship. I venture to say that I do not stand before you either as a saint or a candidate for dictatorship. I stand before you to present to you the results of my many years' practical experience in non-co-operation. I deny the charge that it is a new thing in the country. It has been accepted at hundreds of meetings attended by thousands of men, and has been placed in working order since the first of August by the Mussalmans, and many of the things in the programme are being enforced in a more or less intense form. I ask you again to dismiss personalities in the consideration of this important question, and bring to bear patient and calm judgment on it. But a mere acceptance of the resolution does not end the work. Every individual has to enforce the items of the resolution in so far as they apply to him. I beseech you to give me a patient hearing. I ask you neither to clap nor to hiss. I do not mind them so far as I am concerned, but clapping hinders the flow of thought, clapping and hissing hinder the process of correspondence between a speaker and his audience. You will not hiss out of the stage any single speaker. For non-co-operation is a measure of discipline and sacrifice and it demands patience and respect for opposite views. And unless we were able

to evolve a spirit of mutual toleration for diametrically opposite views, non-co-operation is an impossibility. Non-co-operation in an angry atmosphere is an impossibility. I have learnt through bitter experience the one supreme lesson to conserve my anger, and as heat conserved is transmuted into energy, even so our anger controlled can be transmuted into a power which can move the world. To those who have been attending the Congress, as brothers in arms I ask what can be better discipline than that which we should exercise between ourselves.

I have been told that I have been doing nothing but wreckage and that by bringing forward the resolution, I am breaking up the political life of the country. The Congress is not a party organisation. It ought to provide a platform for all shades of opinions, and a minority need not leave this organisation, but may look forward to translate itself into a majority, in course of time, if its opinion commended itself to the country. Only let no man in the name of the Congress advocate a policy which has been condemned by the Congress. And if you condemn my policy, I shall not go away from the Congress, but shall plead with them to convert the minority into a majority.

ENFORCE CLEAR REPENTENCE

There are no two opinions as to the wrong done to the Khilafat. Mussalmans cannot remain as honourable men and follow their Prophet if they do not vindicate their honour at any cost. The Punjab has been cruelly, brutally treated, and inasmuch as one man in the Punjab was made to crawl on his belly, the whole of India crawled on her

belly, and if we are worthy sons and daughters of India, we should be pledged to remove these wrongs. It is in order to remove these wrongs that the country is agitating itself. But we have not been able to bend the Government to our will. We cannot rest satisfied with a mere expression of angry feeling. You could not have heard a more passionate denunciation of the Punjab wrongs than in the pages of the Presidential address. If the Congress cannot wring justice from unwilling hands, how can it vindicate its existence and its honour? How can it do so if it cannot enforce clear repentance, before receiving a single gift, however rich, from those blood-stained-hands.

EXTEND THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE

I have therefore placed before you my scheme of non-co-operation to achieve this end and want you to reject any other scheme, unless you have deliberately come to the conclusion that it is a better scheme than mine. ✓ If there is a sufficient response to my scheme, I make bold to reiterate my statement that you can gain Swarajya in the course of an year. Not the passing of the resolution will bring Swarajya, but the enforcement of the resolution from day to day in a progressive manner, due regard being had to the condition in the country. ✓ There is another remedy before the country, and that is, drawing of the sword. If that was possible India would not have listened to the gospel of non-co-operation. } I want to suggest to you that even if you want to arrest injustice by methods of violence, discipline and self-sacrifice are necessary. I have not known of a war gained by a

rabble, but I have known of wars gained by disciplined armies and if you want to give battle to the British Government and to the combined power of Europe, we must train ourselves in discipline and self-sacrifice. I confess I have become impatient. I have seen that we deserve Swarajya to day, but we have not got the spirit of national sacrifice. We have evolved this spirit in domestic affairs, and I have come to ask you to extend it to other affairs. I have been travelling from one end to the other of the country to see whether the country has evolved the national spirit, whether at the altar of the nation it is ready to dedicate its riches, children, its all, if it was ready to make the initiatory sacrifice. Is the country ready? Are the title-holders ready to surrender their titles? Are parents ready to sacrifice literary education of their children for the sake of the country? "The schools and colleges are really a factory for turning out clerks for Government. If the parents are not ready for the sacrifice, if title-holders are not ready, Swarajya is very nearly an impossibility. No nation being under another nation can accept gifts and kick at the responsibility attaching to those gifts, imposed by the conquering nation. Immediately the conquered country realised instinctively that any gift which might come to it is not for the benefit of the conquered but for the benefit of the conqueror, that moment it should reject every form of voluntary assistance to him. These are the fundamental essentials of success in the struggle for the independence of the country, whether within the Empire or without the Empire. I hold a real substantial unity between

Hindus and Mussalmans infinitely superior to the British connection and if I had to make a choice between that unity and the British connection, I would have the first and reject other. ✓ If I had to choose between the honour of the Punjab, anarchy, neglect of education, shutting out of all legislative activity, and British connection, I would choose the honour of the Punjab and all it meant, even anarchy, shutting out of all schools, etc., without slightest hesitation.)

If you have the same feeling burning in you as in me for the honour of Islam and the Punjab then you will unreservedly accept my resolution.

BOYCOTT OF COUNCILS

I now come to the burning topic *viz.*, the boycott of the councils. Sharpest difference of opinion existed regarding this, and if the house has to divide on it, it must divide. If it must divide you will consider that it must divide on one issue *viz.*, whether Swarajya has to be gained through the councils or without the councils. If we utterly distrust the British Government and we know that they are utterly unrepentant, how can you believe that the councils will lead to Swarajya and not tighten the British hold on India?

SWADESHI

I now come to Swadeshi. The boycott of foreign goods is included in the resolution. You have got here, I confess, an anomaly for which I am not originally responsible. But I have consented to it. I will not go into the history of how it found a place into the resolution, of which the

essence is discipline and self-sacrifice. Swadeshi means permanent boycott of foreign goods. It is therefore a matter of redundancy. But I have taken it in, because I could not reject it as a matter of conscience. I know, however, it is a physical impossibility. So long as we have to rely on the pins and needles—figurative and literal both—we cannot bring about a complete boycott of foreign goods. I do not hesitate to say this clause mars the musical harmony, if I may claim it without vanity, of the programme. I feel that these words do mar the symmetry of the programme. But I am not here for symmetry of the programme as for its workability.

‘I again ask you not to be influenced by personality. Reject out of your consideration any service that I have done. Two things only I claim. Laborious industry, great thought behind any programme, and unflinching determination to bring it about. You may take only those things from me, and bring them to bear on any programme that you adopt.’

THE SIN OF SECRECY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 22, 1920.)

One of the curses of India is often the sin of secrecy. For fear of an unknown consequence we talk in whispers. Nowhere has this secrecy oppressed me more than in Bengal. Everybody wishes to speak to you ‘in private.’ The spectacle of innocent young men looking around, before opening their lips, to see that no third party overhears

their conversation has given me the greatest grief. Every stranger is suspected of belonging to the secret service. I have been warned to beware of strangers. The cup of my misery was filled when I was told that the unknown student who presided at the students' meeting belonged to the secret service department. I could recall the names of at least two prominent leaders who are suspected in high Indian circles of being spies of the Government.

I feel thankful to God that for years past I have come to regard secrecy as a sin more especially in politics. If we realised the presence of God as witness to all we say and do, we would not have anything to conceal from anybody on earth. For, we would not think unclean thoughts before our Maker, much less speak them. It is uncleanness that seeks secrecy and darkness. The tendency of human nature is to hide dirt, we do not want to see or touch dirty things: we want to put them out of sight. And so must it be with our speech. I would suggest that we should avoid even thinking thoughts we would hide from the world.

This desire for secrecy has bred cowardice amongst us and has made us dissemble our speech. The best and the quickest way of getting rid of this corroding and degrading secret service is for us to make a final effort to think everything aloud, to have no privileged conversation with any soul on earth and to cease to fear the spy. We must ignore his presence and treat everyone as a friend entitled to know all our thoughts and plans. I know that I have achieved most satisfactory results from evolving the boldest of my plans in broad daylight. I have never.

lost a minute's peace for having detectives by my side. The public may not know that I have been shadowed throughout my stay in India. That has not only not worried me but I have even taken friendly services from these gentlemen: many have apologised for having to shadow me. As a rule what I have spoken in their presence has already been published to the world. The result is that now I do not even notice the presence of these men and I do not know that the government is much the wiser for having watched my movements through its secret agency. My opinion is that these agents accompany me as a matter of form or routine. They certainly never bother me. I venture to make a present of my experience to every young man in Bengal and for that matter, in India. No one need think that my public position, and not my openness, saves me from offensive attention. It is the simplest thing to see that the moment you cease to dread the presence of the spy and therefore refuse to treat him as such, that moment his presence ceases to offend you. Soon the government will feel ashamed to have its secret service department or, if it does not, the secret police will be sick of an occupation which serves no use.

Non-co-operation is essentially a cleansing process. It deals with causes rather than symptoms. The detective department is a symptom of the secrecy which is the cause. Removal of secrecy brings about the full disappearance of the secret service without further effort. The Press Act is a symptom of the disease of cowardice. If we would boldly declare our intentions, the Press Act will die of inanition. The beginners will have to suffer

for their so-called daring. I hear that the *Servant* of Calcutta has been served with a warning for its tenacity to take over an article from *Young India* condensing Mr. Rajgopalachari's admirable instructions to voters. I notice too that the most telling passages of my speech in Calcutta have been omitted by the press evidently for fear of the censor. I would far rather see a complete stoppage of a newspaper if the editor cannot without fear of the consequence freely express his sentiments or publish those which he approves.

Non-co-operation while it gladly avails itself of the assistance that may be rendered by the press, it is,—has to be—by its very nature independent of the press. There can be no doubt that every thought we print is being printed on sufferance. As soon as its circulation takes effect, the Government for the sake of its existence, will try to prohibit it. * We may not expect this or any government to commit suicide. It must either reform or repress.

In the ordinary course repression must precede reform under a despotic government such as ours. The stoppage of the circulation of potent ideas that may destroy the government or compel repentance will be the least among the weapons in its repressive armoury. We must therefore devise methods of circulating our ideas unless and until the whole press becomes fearless, defies consequences and publishes ideas, even when it is in disagreement with them, just for the purpose of securing its freedom. An editor with an original idea or an effective prescription for India's ills can easily write them out, a hundred hands can copy them, many more can read them out to thousands of listeners. ✓ I do hope there-

from that non-co-operation editors, at any rate, will not refrain from expressing their thoughts for fear of the Press Act. They should regard it as sinful to keep their thoughts secret—a waste of energy to conduct a newspaper that cramps their thoughts. It is negation of one's calling for an editor to have to suppress his best thoughts.

MR. GANDHI'S CALCUTTA SPEECH

(*December, 22, 1920.*)

[The following is a fairly full report of Mr. Gandhi's important speech at Calcutta on the 13th December, 1920.]

THE CRY FOR SPEECHES IN ENGLISH

The very fact, that so many of you cannot understand Hindi which is bound to be the national medium of expression throughout Hindustan in gatherings of Indians belonging to different parts of the land, shows the depth of the degradation to which we have sunk, and points to the supreme necessity of the non-co-operation movement which is intended to lift us out of that condition. This Government has been instrumental in degrading this great nation in various ways, and it is impossible to be free from it without co-operation amongst ourselves which is in turn impossible without a national medium of expression.

NON-VIOLENT PROGRESSIVE NON-CO-OPERATION

But I am not here to day to plead for that medium I am to plead for the acceptance by the country of the programme of non-violent, progressive, non-co-operation. Now all the words that I have used here are absolutely

necessary and the two adjectives 'progressive' and 'non-violent' are integral part of a whole. (With me non-violence is part of my religion, a matter of creed. But with the great number of Mussalmans non-violence is a policy, with thousands, if not millions of Hindus, it is equally a matter of policy. But whether it is a creed or a policy, it is utterly impossible for you to finish the programme for the enfranchisement of the millions of India, without recognising the necessity and the value of non-violence. Violence may for a moment avail to secure a certain measure of success but it could not in the long run achieve any appreciable result. On the other hand all violence would prove destructive to the honour and self-respect of the nation. The blue books issued by the Government of India show that inasmuch as we have used violence, military expenditure has gone up, not proportionately but in geometrical progression. The bonds of our slavery have been forged all the stronger for our having offered violence.) And the whole history of British rule in India is a demonstration of the fact that we have never been able to offer successful violence. Whilst therefore I say that rather than have the yoke of a Government that has so emasculated us, I would welcome violence, I would urge with all the emphasis that I can command that India will never be able to regain her own by methods of violence.

THE SWARAJ OF MY IDEAL

Lord Ronaldshay who has done me the honour of reading my booklet on Home Rule has warned my countrymen against engaging themselves in a struggle for a

Swaraj such as is described in that booklet. Now though I do not want to withdraw a single word of it, I would say to you on this occasion that I do not ask India to follow out to-day the methods prescribed in my booklet. If they could do that, they would have Home Rule not in a year but in a day, and India by realising that ideal wants to acquire an ascendancy over the rest of the world. But it must remain a day-dream more or less for the time being. What I am doing to-day is that I am giving the country a pardonable programme, not for the abolition of law courts, posts, telegraphs and of railways, but for the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj. I am telling you to do that so long as we do not isolate ourselves from this Government, we are co-operating with it through schools, law courts and councils, through service civil and military and payment of taxes and foreign trade.

WHY PROGRESSIVE

The moment this fact is realised and non-co-operation is effected, this Government must totter to pieces. If I knew that the masses were prepared for the whole programme at once, I would not delay in putting it at once to work. It is not possible, at the present moment, to prevent the masses from bursting out into wrath against those who come to execute the law; it is not possible that the military would lay down their arms without the slightest violence. If that were possible to-day, I would propose all the stages of non-co-operation to be worked simultaneously. But we have not secured that control over the masses! We have uselessly frittered away precious years of the nation's life in mastering a language which

we need least for winning our liberty, we have frittered away all those years in learning liberty from Milton and Shakespeare, in deriving inspiration from the pages of Mill, whilst liberty could be learnt at our doors. We have thus succeeded in isolating ourselves from the masses : we have been Westernised. We have failed these 35 years to utilise our education in order to permeate the masses. We have sat upon the pedestal and from there delivered harangues to them in a language they do not understand and we see to-day that we are unable to conduct large gatherings in a disciplined manner. And discipline is the essence of success. Here is therefore one reason why I have introduced the word 'progressive' in the Non-cooperation Resolution. Without any impertinence I may say that I understand the mass mind better than any one amongst the educated Indians. I contend that the masses are not ready for suspension of payment of taxes. They have not yet learnt sufficient self-control. If I was sure of non-violence on their part I would ask them to suspend payment to-day and not waste a single moment of the nation's time. With me the liberty of India has become a passion. Liberty of Islam is as dear to me. I would not therefore delay a moment if I found that the whole of the programme could be enforced at once.

WHY NON-VIOLENT

It grieves me to miss the faces of dear and revered leaders in this assembly. We miss here the trumpet voice of Surendranath Banerji who has rendered inestimable service to the country. And though we stand as poles asunder to-day, though we may have sharp differences with

him, we must express them with becoming restraint. I do not ask you to give up a single iota of principle. I urge non-violence in language and in deed. If non-violence is essential in our dealings with the Government, it is more essential in our dealings with our leaders. And it grieves me deeply to hear of recent instances of violence reported to have been used in East Bengal against our own people. I was pained to hear that the ears of a man who had voted at the recent elections had been cut, and night soil had been thrown into the bed of a man who had stood as a candidate. Non-co-operation is never going to succeed in this way. It will not succeed unless we create an atmosphere of perfect freedom, unless we prize our opponents' liberty as much as our own. The liberty of faith, conscience, thought and action which we claim for ourselves must be conceded equally to others. Non-co-operation is a process of purification and we must continually try to touch the hearts of those who differ from us, their minds, and their emotions, but never their bodies. Discipline and restraint are the cardinal principles of our conduct and I warn you against any sort of tyrannical social ostracism. I was deeply grieved therefore to hear of the insult offered to a dead body in Delhi and feel that if it was the action of non-co-operators they have disgraced themselves and their creed. (I repeat we cannot deliver our land through violence.)

SWARAJ IN ONE YEAR

It was not a joke when I said on the congress platform that Swaraj could be established in one year if there was sufficient response from the nation. Three months of this-

year are gone. If we are true to our salt, true to our nation, true to the songs we sing, if we are true to the Bhagwad Gita and the Koran, we would finish the programme in the remaining nine months and deliver Islam, the Punjab and India.

(I have proposed a limited programme workable within one year, having especial regard to the educated classes. We seem to be labouring under the illusion that we cannot possibly live without councils, law courts and schools provided by the Government. The moment we are disillusioned we have Swaraj. It is demoralising both for government and the governed that a hundred thousand pilgrims should dictate terms to a nation composed of three hundred millions. And how is it they can thus dictate terms? It is because we have been divided and they have ruled. I have never forgotten Humes' frank confession that the British Government was sustained by the policy of "Divide and Rule". Therefore it is that I have laid stress upon Hindu Moslem Unity as one of the most important essentials for the success of Non-co-operation.) But it should be no lip unity nor *bania* unity, it should be a unity broad-based on a recognition of the heart. If we want to save Hinduism I say, for God's sake, do not seek to bargain with the Mussalmans. I have been going about with Maulana Shaukat Ali all these months, but I have not so much as whispered anything about the protection of the cow.) My alliance with the Ali Brothers is one of honour. I feel that I am on my honour, the whole of Hinduism is on its honour, and if it will not be found wanting, it will do its duty towards the Mussalmans of India. Any bargaining would be degrading to us. Light

brings light not darkness, and nobility done with a noble purpose will be twice rewarded. It will be God alone who can protect the cow. Ask me not to day, 'what about the cow', ask me after Islam is vindicated through India. Ask the Rajas what they do to entertain their English guests. Do they not provide beef and champagne for their guests? Persuade them first to stop cow killing and then think of bargaining with Mussalmans. And how are we Hindus behaving ourselves towards the cow and her progeny? Do we treat her as our religion requires us? Not till we have set our own house in order and saved the cow from the Englishmen, have we the right to plead on her behalf with the Mussalmans. And the best way of saving the cow from them is to give them unconditional help in their hour of trouble.

THE LESSON FROM THE PUNJAB

Similarly what do we owe the Punjab? (The whole of India was made to crawl on her belly inasmuch as a single Punjabi was made to crawl in that dirty lane in Amritsar; the whole womanhood of India was unveiled inasmuch as the innocent women of Manianwalla were unveiled by an insolent officer; and Indian childhood was dishonoured in that the school-children of tender age were made to walk four times a day to stated places within the martial area in the Punjab and to salute the Union Jack, through the effect of which order, two children, seven years old, died of sun stroke having been made to wait in the noon-day sun.) In my opinion it is a sin to attend the schools and colleges conducted under the aegis of this Government so long as it

has not purged itself of these crimes by proper repentance. We may not with any sense of self-respect plead before the courts of the Government when we remember that it was through the Punjab Courts that innocent men were sentenced to be imprisoned and hanged. We become participators in the crime of the Government by voluntarily helping it or being helped by it.

The women of India have intuitively understood the spiritual nature of the struggle. Thousands have attended to listen to the message of non-violent non-co-operation and have given me their precious ornaments for the purpose of advancing the cause of Swaraj. Is it any wonder if I believe the possibility of gaining Swaraj within a year after all these wonderful demonstrations? I would be guilty of want of faith in God if I underrated the significance of the response from the women of India. I hope that the students will do their duty. The country certainly expects the lawyers who have hitherto led public agitation to recognise the new awakening.

CONCLUSION

I have used strong language but I have done so with the greatest deliberation. I am not actuated by any feeling of revenge. I do not consider Englishmen as my enemy. I recognise the worth of many. I enjoy the privilege of having many English friends, but I am a determined enemy of the English rule as is conducted at present and if the power—*tapasya*—of one man could destroy it, I would certainly destroy it, if it could not be mended. An Empire that stands for injustice and breach of faith does not deserve to stand if its custodians will not repent

and Non-co-operation has been devised in order to enable the nation to compel justice.

I hope that Bengal will take her proper place in this movement of self-purification. Bengal began swadeshi and national education when the rest of India was sleeping. I hope that Bengal will come to the front in this movement for gaining Swaraj and gaining justice for the Khilafat and the Punjab through purification and self-sacrifice.

—

‘IN THE THROES OF A NEW BIRTH’

(February 2, 1921.) A best lesson for
derive advantage
don't fail, read
carefully.

[At a monster meeting of students held in Mirzapur Park, Calcutta, Mr. Gandhi spoke as follows :—]

Mr. Chairman and friends,—Let me congratulate the students of Bengal on the very magnificent response they have returned to the call of the country. I knew that the students of Calcutta were waiting for my friend, Mr. C. R. Das, to give them the lead. I congratulate him upon his having given you the lead and I congratulate you, the students of Bengal, upon having followed that lead. But you know as well as I do that the task for him and for you has only just commenced. We are in the throes of a new birth and we are experiencing all the difficulties and all the pains that attend a new birth. It is not enough for him, it is not enough for India that you have emptied the Colleges. It is absolutely necessary that you must not return to the colleges and schools that you have abandoned, and it is necessary for him to find out for you the

work that you should do during this period of probation, during this period of purification.

THE ONLY WAY

It has now become necessary for Mr. C. R. Das and for you to put your heads together and devise means whereby you may complete the work that you have begun. Any way, you, the students, who have withdrawn from the Government and Government-aided schools have completed your work. But in order that that work may be sustained, that that work may be continued, and in order that your services may be harnessed for the attainment of Swaraj, it is necessary to find out the ways and means. And I cannot describe to you how much it grieves me to find that, whilst the student world has responded so nobly, the professors and educationists and the trustees of the great educational institutions of Bengal are not giving the lead they should have. In drawing your attention and their attention to this fact, I do not wish to be understood as casting any reflection upon them, or their love for the country. I know, I am convinced, they believe that you have erred. I know that they believe that Mr. Das has erred in asking you not to seek shelter behind your conscience but to respond to the call of the nation. They believe that I am grievously in error in having presented Non-co-operation to the country, and they sincerely believe that I am still more grievously in error in having advised the students to boycott Government educational institutions.

But in spite of all the experience that I have gone through, in spite of all that I have heard and read, and

in spite of all the reverence that I tender to our elders and our leaders, I am here to confess before you that I am more than ever convinced of the correctness of the step that I have suggested to the country. I am more than ever convinced that, if we desire to establish the Swaraj of our choice, if we want to retrieve the lost honour of India, if we want to retrieve the honour of Islam which is trembling in the balance, it is absolutely necessary for us to tell this Government that it shall not receive any help from us, nor will we receive any help from a Government which has forfeited all confidence. I know those of you who are sceptics will tell me or tell yourselves, that you have heard this kind of talk many a time from such platforms: it is true. But Max Muller has told us—he has paraphrased a Sanskrit proverb—that a truth always bears repetition until it has gone home, and I propose to reiterate this truth in the ears of my countrymen—to reiterate this truth before our leaders till it goes home, till they respond to it. I am here to repeat what I have said from so many platforms that India will not regain her lost honour—her lost freedom—until India has responded to the call of Non-co-operation. It is not possible for Indians, constituted as we are, to give battle to this great Government on any other terms.

THE GENESIS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

Non-co-operation is bred in the very marrow of every Indian, and if you want to know why the crores and millions of the masses have responded to the call of Non-co-operation as they have never responded to any other

call, it is not because I gave voice to that call. Non-co-operation is born, is bred in them—it is part of every religion—it is part of Hinduisim—it is part of Islam, and it is for that reason that, fallen though we are, helpless though we feel ourselves to be, Non-co-operation has awakened us from this long sleep. Non-co-operation has given us faith, has given us courage, has given us hope, and strength.

THE REASON FOR SCEPTICISM

And if our educated leaders have not yet responded to the call of Non-co-operation, let me say with all the humility that I can command that they are sceptics, they have not the religious fire of the people and the masses. They are saturated in modern civilisation, or as we call it Western civilization. I have used the term Western civilization. But I want you and myself this evening to distinguish between the two. I want to make it clear that I am no hater of the West. I am thankful to the West for many a thing. I have learnt from Western literature. But I am here to confess to you that I am thankful to modern civilisation for teaching me that, if I want India to rise to its fullest height, I must tell my countrymen frankly that, after years and years of experience of modern civilisation, I have learnt one lesson from it and that is that we must shun it at all costs. What is that modern civilisation? It is the worship of the material, it is the worship of the brute in us—it is unadulterated materialism, and *modern* civilization is nothing if it does not think at every step of the triumph of *material* civilisation.

THE MODERN CIVILIZATION

And if I did not know my country, if I did not know the mass mind, I would also have erred, and I would also have been misled, even as I contend that educated India has been misled. You, my countrymen, know that I have lived for 20 years in the midst of modern activity—I have lived in a country which has copied everything that is modern. I have lived in a country which is pulsating with new life. South Africa contains some of the bravest of men on the face of the earth and I have seen modern civilisation worked by that nation at its best; and I am here to tell you, the youngmen of Bengal, and I am here to tell my educated leaders, that my experience of modern civilisation, worked at its best, told me in emphatic terms in the year 1908: “God save India from that modern curse”. This is a lesson that I have learnt in South Africa though it is the lesson that I have followed up since 1908, and which slowly but surely I have been preaching in season and out of season during my five years’ stay in India. And it was my faith in our ancient civilisation—it was my faith in our simplicity,—it was my faith in the inborn religious instincts of every Indian—be he a Hindu or be he a Mahomedan, Christian, Parsi or Jew—it is that faith in me which has sustained me throughout all the dark days of scoffing, of scepticism, and of opposition.

A RELIGIOUS BATTLE

I know that opposition stares you and stares me in the face even to-day. We have just broken the ground, but

it is true that if we are going to win this great battle that you, the people of Calcutta, commenced in September of last year, we shall have to continue as we have begun in full faith. I am not ashamed to repeat before you who seem to be nurtured in modern traditions—who seem to be filled with the writings of modern writers, I am not ashamed to repeat before you that this is a religious battle. I am not ashamed to repeat before you that this is an attempt to revolutionise the political outlook—that this is an attempt to spiritualise our politics. And the more we have of it, I assure you, the greater progress we shall make towards our goal. It is because I believe that the mass mind of India is to-day ready, it is because I believe that the mass mind of India is tired of this British rule in its present form that I have made bold to say that Swaraj is easily attainable within one year.

SWARAJ IN EIGHT MONTHS

Four months of this one year have already gone by, and my faith has never burnt as brightly as it burns to-night, as I am talking to the young men of Bengal. You have given me greater hope, you have given me greater courage—you have given me greater strength. May God grant that Shaukat Ali and Mahommad Ali and I will live to erect this flag of Swaraj inside this year! But if it is the will of God that my ashes should be placed in the Ganges water before the eight months of the year is out, I shall die with the conviction that you will see to it that Swaraj is secured before this year is out.

This is not as difficult as you may imagine. The difficulty lies with our conviction. The difficulty lies in

our believing that we want to have lessons in Swaraj in the council hall. The difficulty lies in our believing that we cannot get Swaraj until we have passed through a sixteen years' course of education, and if we believe in all these things I shall be free to confess that we should require a century to get Swaraj. But it is because I believe that we need not these things, but we need faith, courage and strength and it is because I believe that the masses have got all these things to-day that I believe that Swaraj is attainable within this year.

INDIA OF THE MASSES

And what does the appeal of the Congress mean? The Congress appeal means that you and I, that the whole of educated India, the whole of the mercantile community of India—a mere drop in the ocean of millions of people of India, the artisans and the agriculturists—have a test placed before them. And believe me that the Congress will isolate India and wrest Swaraj from insolent hands and establish the flag of Freedom, if possible with your assistance, even without your assistance if need be. The whole of India is not concentrated in the educated India of to-day. India can sustain its hope, even if the whole of educated India were to remain sceptic, were to remain without hope, and faith, and courage, and strength. It is that faith which sustains me. But I am hoping that if the student world and if the students of Bengal remain true to their vow, I am hoping that the professors and the trustees and the educationists of Bengal and India will respond to the call and their winter of discontent will be turned by you into the summer of hope.

NO BASE COPY

I ask you, the young men of Bengal, to abide by the decision that you have come to—no matter what happens. I know that Mr. C. R. Das is going to remain true to his promise. He has already received a promise of Rs. 10,000 to be given to him now and ten thousand annual contribution from a great Bengali. He has received certain promises from the Marwaris—the domiciled Marwaris of Calcutta and he is going to receive many more promises, so far as the finance is concerned, but finance is the least part of the difficulty. He has to find out a habitation for having the college located. He has to find out better professors. And I ask you students who have non-co-operated not to set before yourselves the old standard, even as this Swaraj of our dream is not to be a base copy of what we have to-day. So will you please see that what you get in the shape of a new college is not to be a base copy of what you have to-day. You will not look to brick and mortar. You will not look to benches and chairs for inspiration, you will look to character. You will look to sterling character in your professors and in your teachers for inspiration. You will look to your own determination to give you the necessary impetus and necessary inspiration. And I promise you that you will then not be disappointed, but if you believe that Mr. Das is going to present you with noble buildings, if you believe that he is going to give every ease and luxury to which you have been hitherto used, you will certainly be disappointed.

A NEW GOSPEL

I have come this evening to present before you a newer gospel, a better gospel. If you are determined to

attain Swaraj inside of twelve months, if you are determined to help to attain Swaraj within one year, then I ask you to make the way of those who have dedicated their lives to the attainment of Swaraj easier and clearer by accepting the advice that I am about to tender to you. If you believe that Swaraj can be attained by continuing your colleges and schools precisely in the same manner as the institutions that you have left are being conducted, you are sadly mistaken. No country in the world has gained its liberty—has seen a new birth without difficulties, without pain, without sacrifice. And what is sacrifice? The right meaning of sacrifice I learnt in my youth was that it meant making sacred, making holy. Non-co-operation is a process of purification, and if a suspension of ordinary routine is necessary for the purpose of that purification, that has to be done. I know, if I know Bengal at all, that you will not shirk it and you will respond.

THE DUTY OF SPINNING

Our education has been the most deficient in two things. Those who formed our education code neglected the training of the body and the soul. You are not receiving the education of the soul.
 Non-co-operation is nothing less and nothing more than withdrawing from participation in the evil that this Government is doing and continuing to do. And if we are withdrawing from evil conscientiously, deliberately, it means that we are walking with our face towards God. That completes or begins the soul training. But seeing that our bodily education has been neglected, and

seeing that India has become enslaved because India forgot the spinning wheel, and because India sold herself for a mess of pottage, I am not afraid to place before you, the young men of Bengal, the spinning wheel for adoption. And let a training in spinning and production of as much yarn as you can ever do constitute your main purpose and your main training during this year of probation. Let your ordinary education commence after Swaraj is established, but let every young man, and every girl of Bengal consider it to be their sacred duty to devote all their time and energy to spinning. I have drawn attention to the parallel, that presents itself before us, from the war.

WAR SERVICE

Those of you who know anything about what was going on in England will recall those days of the War when every boy and every girl had suspended their education—ordinary education, and were put upon such national work as was necessary for the purpose of the War. They were put upon simple tailoring, upon making badges and what was done even here? I recall many a home where even little children were put to work and the Government looked upon my activity with sympathy, with attention and approval, when I presented to the youths of Kaira the opportunity of fighting on the battle field even though their parents might be against it. Times have changed and I am now twitted for asking young men who have got heads on their shoulders and who have conscience in their hearts—I am twitted for asking these young men and girls and for having the audacity to tell them that they should rather obey the voice of their cons-

cience than the voice or commands of even their parents. But I say to the young men and young girls of Bengal that if your voice, the voice of your conscience, tells you that during this year of probation you should devote your energy and attention to the attainment of Swaraj, then you will believe me when I tell you that it is impossible to arrive at a complete boycott of foreign cloth or foreign goods until and unless we employ every man, woman and child on spinning yarn. We have spun many a yarn during all these long 35 years on the Congress platform. Let us now spin the truest yarn that India wants, and let me tell you that, if you want to feed the hungry, to cloth the naked, there is no other way out of the difficulty but spinning for the whole of India. And so I ask you, young men of Bengal, to accept the privilege that I place at your feet. And if we can bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth, we sterilise the activity of the fifty-five members of the House of Commons that Lancashire contributes to it, we sterilise the activities of ambitious Japan who has her eyes fixed and set upon India. You will not gain your economic freedom, as the Congress has told you, until India becomes self-contained so far as her food and clothing are concerned. We can do without all things but we cannot do without food and clothing. A vast country like India, 1900 miles long and 1500 miles broad, cannot possibly become self-contained by any other means than the means of old. If you want to do penance for what Bengal did and what the whole of India did during the East India Company's regime, even then you have no other remedy—no other penance open to you but to revive those noble arts and industries

and to present India with sufficient yarn, so that the prices of cloth and clothing may both go down and so that India may not have to depend upon foreigners for her special needs.

AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY

So, young men of Bengal, if you will work in order to gain Swaraj within one year, you will accept the advice of a man who has conducted a series of experiments, to whom this gospel came in the year 1908, and who has not yet been ousted from it by a hair's breadth. The more I have studied the economics of India, the more I have listened to the mill-owners of India, the more convinced I have become that until we introduce the spinning wheel in every home of India, the economic salvation and freedom of India is an impossibility. Go to any mill-owner you like, he will tell you that it will require fifty years if India is to become self-contained, so far as cloth supplies are concerned, if she has to depend upon her mills alone. And let me supplement the information by telling you that to-day hundreds and thousands of weavers are weaving and are able to weave home-spun yarn, but they have to fall back upon foreign yarn because mills cannot supply them. So I ask the young friends of Bengal who have left their colleges to go forward in hope and courage and take up this neglected training of the hand for at least the time that we have not attained Swaraj and then think of anything else.

THE NEED FOR HINDUSTANI

I have suggested another thing. You and I, and every one of us has neglected the true education that we should

have received in our national schools. It is impossible for the young men of Bengal, for the young men of Gujarat, for the young men of the Deccan, to go to the Central Provinces, to go to the United Provinces, to go to the Punjab and all those vast tracts of India which speak nothing but Hindustani, and therefore I ask you to learn Hindustani also in your leisure hours—the hours that you may be able to save after spinning. And if you will learn these things you can learn both spinning and Hindustani in two months. An intelligent, gentle lad, a patriotic and hardworking lad, I promise you, can learn both these in two month's time. And then you are free to go out to your villages—you are free to go to every part of India but Madras, and be able to speak your mind to the masses. Do not consider for one moment that you can possibly make English a common medium of expression between masses. Twenty-two crores of Indians know Hindustani—they do not know any other language. And if you want to steal into the hearts of 22 crores of Indians, Hindustani is the only language open to you. If you will do but these two things, during this year, during these nine months, believe me, you will have, by the time you have finished, acquired courage and acquired strength which you do not possess to-day. I know thousands of students—black despair stares them in the face if they are told that they cannot get Government employ. If you are bent upon ending or mending the Government how do you propose to get Government employ? If you do not want to fall back upon Government, what is your English knowledge worth? I do not wish to underrate the literary value of the English language. I do not wish

to underrate the vast treasures that are buried in the English books. I do not want to suggest to you that we have overrated the importance of the English language but I do venture to suggest to you that the English language finds very little place in the economy of Swaraj.

ALL FOR THE MOTHERLAND

You do not need to increase the stock of English words in order to gain Swaraj and so I have suggested to the youngmen of Gujarat that they should suspend their literary training in English for these nine or twelve months and devote their time and their leisure to learning spinning and to learning Hindusthani and then place themselves at the disposal of India, and join the National Service that is going to be formed. You are not going to respond to the great constitution that the Congress has given unless we have got an army of workers penetrating the seven and a half lakhs of villages with which India is studded, if we are going to set up a rival organisation in every village of India, if we are going to have a representative of the Congress in every village of India ; we cannot do so until and unless the youngmen of India respond to the Motherland. The privilege to pay is yours. The call to-day has come to the young men of Bengal and the rest of India. I hope, I have every confidence, that all the young men and all the young girls of India will respond to this sacred call. I promise that before the year is out you will not have regretted the day that you set your heart upon these two things, and you will find at the end of the chapter that what I am saying to you to-night has come true, that you have vindicated the honour of India, you have

vindicated the honour of Islam, you have vindicated the honour of the whole nation and established Swaraj. May God grant you, the young men and the young girls of Bengal, the necessary courage, the necessary hope, the necessary confidence to go through the sacred period of purification and sacrifice. May God help you.

TO EVERY ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA

(October 27, 1920.)

DEAR FRIEND

I wish that every Englishman will see this appeal and give thoughtful attention to it.

Let me introduce myself to you. In my humble opinion, no Indian has co-operated with the British Government more than I have for an unbroken period of twenty-nine years of public life in the face of circumstances that might well have turned any other man into a rebel. I ask you to believe me when I tell you that my co-operation was not based on the fear of the punishments provided by your laws or any other selfish motives. It was free and voluntary co-operation based on the belief that the sum total of the activity of the British Government was for the benefit of India. I put my life in peril four times for the sake of the Empire;—at the time of the Boer War when I was in charge of the Ambulance Corps whose work was mentioned in General Buller's dispatches, at the time of the Zulu revolt in Natal when I was in charge of a similar corps, at the time of the commencement of the late war when I raised an Ambulance corps and as a result on the strenuous training had a severe

attack of pleurisy and lastly, in fulfilment of my promise to Lord Chelmsford at the War Conference in Delhi, I threw myself in such an active recruiting campaign in Kaira District involving long and trying marches, that I had an attack of dysentery which proved almost fatal. I did all this in the full belief that acts such as mine must gain for my country an equal status in the Empire. So late as last December I pleaded hard for a trustful co-operation. I fully believed that Mr. Lloyd George would redeem his promise to the Mussalmans and that the revelations of the official atrocities in the Punjab would secure full reparation for the Punjabis. But the treachery of Mr. Lloyd George and its appreciation by you, and the condonation of the Punjab atrocities have completely shattered my faith in the good intentions of the Government and the nation which is supporting it.

But though my faith in your good intentions is gone, I recognise your bravery, and I know that what you will not yield to justice and reason, you will gladly yield to bravery.

✓ *See what this Empire means to India:—*

Exploitation of India's resources for the benefit of Great Britain,

An ever-increasing military expenditure, and a civil service the most expensive in the world,

Extravagant working of every department in utter disregard of India's poverty,

Disarmament and consequent emasculation of a whole nation lest an armed nation might imperil the lives of a handful of you in our midst,

Traffic in intoxicating liquors and drugs for the purpose of sustaining a top-heavy administration,

Progressively repressive legislation in order to suppress an evergrowing agitation seeking to give expression to a nation's agony,

Degrading treatment of Indians residing in your dominions, and

You have shown total disregard of our feelings by glorifying the Punjab administration and flouting the Mussalman sentiment.

I know you would not mind if we could fight and wrest the sceptre from your hands. You know that we are powerless to do that, for you have ensured our incapacity to fight in open and honourable battle. Bravery on the battlefield is thus impossible for us. Bravery of the soul still remains open to us. I know you will respond to that also. I am engaged in evoking that bravery. Non-co-operation means nothing less than training in self-sacrifice. Why should we co-operate with you when we know that by your administration of this great country, we are being daily enslaved in an increasing degree. This response of the people to my appeal is not due to my personality. I would like you to dismiss me, and for that matter the Ali Brothers too, from your consideration. My personality will fail to evoke any response to an anti-Muslim cry if I were foolish enough to raise it, as the magic name of the Ali Brothers would fail to inspire the Mussalmans with enthusiasm if they were madly to raise an anti-Hindu cry. People flock in their thousands to listen to us because we to-day represent the voice of a nation groaning under your iron heels. The

Ali Brothers were your friends as I was, and still am. My religion forbids me to bear any ill-will towards you. I would not raise my hand against you even if I had the power. I expect to conquer you only by my suffering. The Ali Brothers will certainly draw the sword, if they could, in defence of their religion and their country. But they and I have made common cause with the people of India in their attempt to voice their feelings and to find a remedy for their distress.

You are in search of a remedy to suppress this rising ebullition of national feeling. I venture to suggest to you that the only way to suppress it is to remove the causes. You have yet the power. You can repent of the wrongs done to Indians. You can compel Mr. Lloyd George to redeem his promises. I assure you he has kept many escape-doors. You can compel the Viceroy to retire in favour of a better one, you can revise your ideas about Sir Michæl O'Dwyer and General Dyer. You can compel the Government to summon a conference of the recognised leaders of the people, duly elected by them and representing all shades of opinion so as to devise means for granting *Swaraj* in accordance with the wishes of the people of India.

But this you cannot do unless you consider every Indian to be in reality your equal and brother. I ask for no patronage, I merely point out to you, as a friend, an honourable solution of a grave problem. The other solution, namely, repression, is open to you. I prophesy that it will fail. It has begun already. The Government has already imprisoned two brave men of Panipat for holding and expressing their opinions freely. Another is on his trial in

Lahore for having expressed similar opinions. One in the Oudh District is already imprisoned. Another awaits judgment. You should know what is going on in your midst. Our propaganda is being carried on in anticipation of repression. I invite you respectfully to choose the better way and make common cause with the people of India whose salt you are eating. To seek to thwart their aspirations is disloyalty to the country.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. Gandhi.

REJOINDER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 15, 1920.)

Messrs. Popley and Phillips have been good enough to reply* to my letter "To Every Englishman in India." I recognise and appreciate the friendly spirit of their letter. But I see that there are fundamental differences

* The following is the reply referred to (to the letter on page 301) :—
DEAR MR. GANDHI,

Thank you for your letter to every Englishman in India, with its hard-hitting and its generous tone. Something within us responds to the note which you have struck. We are not representatives of any corporate body, but we think that millions of our countrymen in England, and not a few in India, feel as we do. The reading of your letter convinces us that you and we cannot be real enemies.

May we say at once that in so far as the British Empire stands for the domination and exploitation of other races for Britain's benefit, for degrading treatment of any, for traffic in intoxicating liquors, for repressive legislation, for administration such as that which led to the Amritsar incidents, we desire the end of it as much as you do? We quite understand that in the excitement of the present crisis, owing to certain acts of the British administra-

which must for the time being divide them and me. So long as I felt that, in spite of grievous lapses, the British Empire represented an activity for the world's and India's good, I clung to it like a child to its mother's breast. But that faith is gone. The British nation has endorsed the Punjab and the Khilafat crimes. There is no doubt a dissenting minority. But a dissenting minority that satisfies

tion, which we join with you in condemning, the Empire presents itself to you under this aspect alone. But from personal contact with our countrymen, we know that working like leaven in the midst of such tendencies, as you and we deplore, is the faith in a better ideal—the ideal of a commonwealth of free peoples voluntarily linked together by the ties of common experience in the past and common aspirations for the future, a commonwealth which may hope to spread liberty and progress through the whole earth. With vast numbers of our countrymen, we value the British Empire mainly as affording the possibility of the realization of such an ideal, and on that ground give it our loyal allegiance.

Meanwhile we do repent of that arrogant attitude to Indians which has been all too common among our countrymen, we do hold Indians to be our brothers and equals, many of them our superiors, and we would rather be servants than rulers of India. We desire an administration which cannot be intimidated either by the selfish element in Anglo-Indian political opinion or by any other sectional interest, and which shall govern in accordance with the best democratic principles. We should welcome the convening of a national assembly of recognized leaders of the people, representing all shades of political opinion, of every caste, race, and creed, to frame a constitution for Swaraj. In all the things that matter most we are with you. Surely you and we can co-operate in the service of India, in such matters, for example, as education. It seems to us nothing short of a tragedy that you should be rallying Indian patriotism to inaugurate a new era of goodwill under a watchword that divides, instead of uniting, all.

We have spoken of the large amount of common ground upon which you and we can stand. But frankness demands that we express our anxiety about some items in your programme. Leaving aside smaller questions on which your letter seems to us to do the British side less than justice, may we mention three main points? Your insistence on spiritual forces alone we deeply respect and desire to emulate, but we cannot

itself with a mere expression of its opinion and continues to help the wrong-doer partakes in the wrong-doing.

And when the sum total of his energy represents a minus quantity one may not pick out the plus quantities, hold them up for admiration, and ask an admiring public to help regarding them. It is a favourite design of Satan to temper evil with a show of good and thus lure the unwary into the trap. The

understand your combining it with a close alliance with those who, as you frankly say, would draw the sword as soon as they could

Your desire for an education truly national commands our whole-hearted approval. But instead of Indianising the present system, as you could begin to do from the beginning of next year, or instead of creating a hundred institutions such as that at Bolpur and turning into them the stream of India's young intellectual life, you appear to be turning that stream out of its present channel into open sands, where it may dry up. In other words, you seem to us to be risking the complete cessation, for a period, possibly of years, of all education for a large number of boys and young men. Is it best for those young men or for India that the present imperfect education should cease before a better education is ready to take its place?

Your desire to unite Muhammedan and Hindu and to share with your Muhammedan brethren in seeking the satisfaction of Muhammedan aspirations, we can understand and sympathise with. But is there no danger in the course which some of your party have urged upon the Government, that certain races in the former Ottoman Empire might be fixed under a foreign yoke, far worse than that which you hold the English yoke to be? You could not wish to purchase freedom in India at the price of enslavement in the middle East.

To sum up, we thank you for the spirit of your letter, to which we have tried to respond in the same spirit. We are with you in the desire for an India genuinely free to develop the best that is in her and in the belief that best is something wonderful of which the world to-day stands in need.

We are ready to co-operate with you and with every other man of any race or nationality who will help India to realize her best. Are you going to insist that you can have nothing to do with us if we receive a government grant (*i.e.*, Indian money) for an Indian School? Surely some more

only way the world has known of defeating Satan is by shunning him. I invite Englishmen, who could work out the ideal they believe in, to join the ranks of non-co-operationists. W. T. Stead prayed for the reverse of the British arms during the Boer war. Miss Hobhouse invited the Boers to keep up the fight. The betrayal of India is much worse than the injustice done to the Boers. The Boers fought and bled for their rights. When, therefore, we are prepared to bleed, the right will have become embodied, and the idolatrous world will perceive it and do homage to it.

But Messrs. Popley and Phillips object that I have allied myself with those who would draw the sword if they could. I see nothing wrong in it. They represent the right no less than I do. And is it not worth while trying to prevent the unsheathing of the sword by helping to win a bloodless battle? Those who recognise the truth of the Indian position can only do God's work by assisting this non-violent campaign.

The second objection raised by these English friends is more to the point. I would be guilty of wrong doing myself if the Muslim cause was not just. The fact is that the Muslim claim is not to perpetuate foreign domina-

inspiring battle cry than non-co-operation can be discovered. We have ventured quite frankly to point out three items in your present programme, which seem to us likely to hinder the attainment of your true ideals for Indian greatness. But those ideals themselves command our warm sympathy, and we desire to work, so far as we have opportunity, for their attainment. In fact, it is only thus that we can interpret our British citizenship.

Bangalore,
November 15, 1920

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) H. A. Popley
(Sd.) G. E. Phillips.

tion of non-Muslim or non-Turkish races. The Indian Mussalmans do not resist self-determination, but they would fight to the last the nefarious plan of exploiting Mesopotamia under the plea of self-determination. They must resist the studied attempt to humiliate Turkey, and therethrough Islam, under the false pretext of ensuring Armenian independence.

The third objection has reference to schools. I do object to missionary or any schools being carried on with Government money. It is true that it was at one time our money. Will these good missionaries be justified in educating me with funds given to them by a robber who has robbed me of my money, religion and honour because the money was originally mine?

I personally tolerated the financial robbery of India, but it would have been a sin to have tolerated the robbery of honour through the Punjab, and of religion through Turkey. This is strong language. But nothing less would truly describe my deep conviction. Needless to add that the emptying of Government, aided, or affiliated schools does not mean starving the young mind: National Schools are coming into being as fast as the others are emptied.

Messrs. Popley and Phillips think that my sense of justice has been blurred by the knowledge of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs. I hope not. I have asked friends to show me some good fruit (intended and deliberately produced) of the British occupation of India. I repeat the request. And I assure them that I shall make the amplest amends if I find that I have erred in my eagerness about the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs.

A CIVILIAN REPLIES

(February 23, 1921).

We reproduce below the correspondence that recently took place between Mr. Fremantle of the Indian Civil Service and Mr. Gandhi, with reference to the latter's letter "To Every Englishman in India" published in these columns (See Page 301) :—

MR. FREMANTLE'S LETTER.

To

Mahatma Gandhi Sahib,

SIR,

I have not had the pleasure of perusing in full the open letter to Europeans in India which I understand you indited last year, and am acquainted with its contents merely through a Hindi translation which I have partly read.

You began, I believe, by some detail of the services you had rendered to the British Empire. Have you ever asked yourself, and if you have not, I would request you to do so now, how far you can hope to impress us with them, having in regard the circumstances Between August 4, 1914 and November 11, 1920, thousands of Englishmen, I am not including those thousands who fought because they were already in the services, or for country's sake, or for adventure, or who were conscribed, thousands of Englishmen joined the colours merely for justice' sake. All of these last men who had no lust for conquest, who would never have fought in the Boer War or any other war of which they in their consciences did not approve, cheerfully faced, not death merely,—that was nothing,—but the exquisite torture of lying wounded for hours in "No Man's Land," and the foul ignominy of a German prisoners' camp. Many were wounded again and again. Many more who have escaped unscathed were six years ago starting hopefully on their careers and now see themselves, by their own voluntary act in joining up cheerfully at the call of right, reduced to indigence. And all this not for a particular motive, but, I repeat, to establish a universal principle. Compared with these what have you suffered? What have you lost that you should presume to place yourself upon an eminence on the strength of any losses or sufferings, and to lecture others?

An eminence! Yes, you are upon one, I will not deny it, but of what elevation? Do you know the delightful story of Alphonse Daudet about the Alpine Club, at Tarascon? You may have seen the low hills he speaks of, from the train between Marseilles and Paris. They had zeal and "selflessness"—these members, their arrangements were perfect; they had axes to their zeal and ropes and alpenstocks and all the paraphernalia of mountaineers, they climbed zealously and with reckless courage to the very topmost point which they from their provincial boulevards could descry, but it was not Mont Blanc. Scarcely one tenth as high! Just similarly you have merely reached just the highest pinnacle within your own orbit of vision and cannot get higher without first going down, which you are not likely to do. There is another thing which distinguishes you, your "idealism". I do not myself think great things of that shallow quality, that mis-called idealism which turns from history and experience to evolve a misty Utopia out of the inner consciousness. To me it seems more like cynicism. To suppose, for example, that the history of the dealings of the West with India, a history of the invitation of British and French traders, soldiers and administrators to settle among people who believed that the West had something valuable to give, of the relinquishment—often voluntary—of large territories to their sway, the eventual secure establishment of a Pax Britannica, to suppose that this was all merely a sort of Beelzebub's progress ending in the aggrandisement of a power with Satanic attributes, is not this to take a cynic's view of human nature?

But though you have not that higher idealism which looks hard at the facts and perceives the ideal in them, which finds in the great march of history a continual progress towards good, you have yet idealism of a kind, low, you are yet high above the depths, above those revolutionaries whose weapons are lies, the dagger, and the bomb. Violence you will not have within the orbit of your personal influence;—we have much to be thankful for. On truth you appear to set a peculiar value. One would suppose that you were in possession of some special Ithuriel's spear, at the touch of whose celestial temper "no falsehood can sustain." It would be a mistake however were we to be so dazzled by the high idea you set before yourself as not to realise that practice toils painfully behind. Not only—to take a recent example—does your unnecessary letter to H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught contain two blatantly false statements, but truthful yourself in the main, you are not—if newspaper reports are correct—scrupulous about lies uttered in your presence. Witness the disgusting aspersion on a British officer now recognised as the

Kachgarhi fable, about his brutally slashing the face or neck of the helpless dying Pathan. It is said that when these edifying details had been recounted before you by the Khilafat lecturer, you far from rebuking what the most elementary knowledge of Englishmen and their ways would have revealed as an absurd concoction,—got up at the close and made a feeling allusion to the story, treating it as accepted truth. The *Tribune* apology is published; we await yours and are likely still to await it. For what is your responsibility? Merely that of getting the seal of your approval on a lie. And what is the seal of your approval worth? Little evidently in your own estimation.

But a public expression of regret for publicly countenancing a gross libel is a sacrifice to truth too great for you to make. It would be too much, too, to expect you to realize what we mean by ingenuousness. to comprehend that a plain man does not—as you do—postpone the issue of orders counteracting the excessive zeal of subordinates till it is too late. But you are not a plain man. If you were, you would condemn a rule permitting direct pressure to be brought on school boys of over sixteen to leave school but not upon those of under sixteen, as the most transparent humbug. But we cannot expect you to see this. You cannot perceive Mont Blanc from where you sit, even although it is upon a pinnacle of veracity far above the Serbonian morass of that riff-raff of followers of yours which undertook to explain to Punjab peasants what the Rowlatt Bills were about.

If you have had patience to follow me so far, you will have been enabled dimly to perceive why I am far indeed from accepting your claims to a sort of spiritual ascendancy, claims which, I am afraid, strike me as profane. Neither they nor anything else that I know of entitled you to write an "Open Letter to Europeans in India." But as you have done so, I consider myself equally entitled to reply.

I do not ask you to retrace your steps. Not only because it would be useless to do so,—not only because I would not for the credit of human nature and the good of India have you reveal yourself what I suspect you of being at heart—a co-operator waiting only for a suitable time to come to terms with this Satanic Government. No, the reason is because you are already on the right path, if you would only pursue it further, even though you yourself hardly know why it is the right path. You have right ideas, however, if you have come by them. But it is necessary to strip off unworthy motives. Cease even to recognize Government by struggling against it. Take a step further and ignore it. Those of us who love learning for its own sake and have been shocked time and again to see it pursued for the

sake of degree,—and the degree itself valued only as a stepping stone to government service,—would be glad indeed to see educational institutions which are really independent of Government. Then again there is litigation. You appear to have recently recognized the evil,—an evil grossly apparent to myself from the day,—twenty years ago,—when I first landed in this country. But it is well that you have done so. Only in the last few months in my district I have had to deplore two distressing cases of homicide arising directly out of litigation. Empty our law-courts, not because you are under the fond impression that Government likes them full, but simply because litigiousness is bad. Another idea is that of home industries. It is puerile to connect the spinning-wheel with Swaraj, as if it were any more likely to introduce Swaraj than the American Constitution or the Great Moghal. But you are on the right road if you teach your fellow-countrymen to love and beautify their homes more than they do, to esteem the dignity of manual labour, and to discard shoddy machine-made goods. If the Spanish saying is true that fine words butter no parsnips it is equally true that harsh words do not either. The work that lies before you needs no admixture of racial hate. If you can carry it through, it will be a hard task enough, and yet an easier, as well as a more useful one than the subversion of the British Government.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

12th February, 1921.

(Sd) A. F. FREMANTLE,
Indian Civil Service.

MR. GANDHI'S REPLY

Dear Sir,

I have just received your letter of the 12th inst. You will please excuse me if I do not reply to your letter in detail.

You have hardly done justice to yourself, in criticising a letter you have never seen and whose translation you have only partly read. ✓ If you had read the letter, you would have seen that I did not mention my services to demonstrate my sufferings, much less to show that they were selfless. I mentioned them merely to show

how consistently loyal I was to the British connection even in the midst of adverse conditions. My services were not selfless, because I believe that I would by those services be assisting my country's progress towards freedom. Your mention of British bravery and selflessness is therefore irrelevant. British bravery and capacity for suffering are beyond question. The claim to national selflessness, you will permit me to deny in toto. I did not believe then, the world does not believe to-day, that the late war was one for justice or was selfless. You wanted to crush the Germans, and for the moment you have succeeded. I do not believe that the Germans are the fiends the English Press has made them out to be, nor do I believe that the world would have come to an end if they had won.

You think that I am on an eminence. I assure you that I am unaware of that. I am however on the top of a volcano which I am trying to turn into hard incombustible rock. It may erupt any moment before I have succeeded. That unfortunately has always been a possible fate for a reformer.

My idealism worries you. If you had taken pains to read my writings, you would have known that it is intensely practical.

You have rightly guessed that I am at bottom a co-operator. How would I be otherwise having been that for nearly thirty years? I am certainly waiting for the first opportunity to co-operate, but, believe me, my co-operation will not be tendered until Englishmen have realised the necessity of settling the Khilafat terms in accordance with the Moslem sentiment, until they have

repented of the calculated torture of the Punjab, and until they have ceased to consider themselves as our patrons and rulers. India will gladly have Englishmen as friends, fellow-workers and equal partners in India, but if they desire to exploit the country for their own gain, they must do so if they can without our co-operation.

You have seen fit to accuse me of deviation from truth. Here again your amazing ignorance is to blame. You were rightly informed that I believed that statement about the Kachagarhi incident, made to me upon oath by persons whom I had no reason for doubting. I published over my signature a denial as soon as I received it. I refer you to the file of *Young India*. Lastly may I ask you to try to study and understand the movement of non-co-operation? You will find that it is not anti-English in spirit. It is a religious movement, it is a purifying movement. It is a movement intended to resist injustice, untruth, terrorism and to establish Swaraj in India. You will admit that it is better to replace mutual distrust and fear by trust and fearlessness.

This movement is an attempt to end that unhappy state. And I seek your co-operation in the effort.

I am,

Yours Faithfully,

(Sd). M. K. GANDHI.

THE CONGRESS AND NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 4, 1920.)

The Hon'ble Pundit Malaviyaji, for whom I entertain the highest regard and whom I have so often described as *Dharmatma*, has appealed to me both publicly and privately to suspend non-co-operation till the Congress has pronounced upon it. The *Mahratta* has also done likewise. These appeals have made me pause and think, but I regret to say that I have not been able to respond to them. I would do much and give much to please Punditji. I am anxious to receive his approbation and blessing for all my actions. But a higher duty requires me not to turn from the course mapped out by the Non-co-operation Committee. There are moments in your life when you must act, even though you cannot carry your best friends with you. The 'still small voice' within you must always be the final arbiter when there is a conflict of duty.

The reason for asking me to suspend action is that the Congress will presently meet and consider the whole question of non-co-operation and give its verdict. It would therefore be better (says Punditji) to await the Congress decision. In my humble opinion it is no Congressman's duty to consult the Congress before taking an action in a matter in which he has no doubts. To do otherwise may mean stagnation.

The Congress is after all the mouth-piece of the nation. And when one has a policy or a programme which one

would like to see adopted, but on which one wants to cultivate public opinion, one naturally asks the Congress to discuss it and form an opinion. But when one has an unshakable faith in a particular policy or action, it would be folly to wait for the Congress pronouncement. On the contrary one must act and demonstrate its efficacy so as to command acceptance by the nation.

My loyalty to the Congress requires me to carry out its policy when it is not contrary to my conscience. If I am in a minority I may not pursue my policy in the name of the Congress. The decision of the Congress on any given question therefore does not mean that it prevents a Congressman from any action to the contrary, but if he acts, he does so at his own risk and with the knowledge that the Congress is not with him.

Every Congressman, every public body has the right, it is sometimes their duty, to express their own opinion, act upon it even and thus anticipate the verdict of the Congress. Indeed it is the best way of serving the nation. By initiating well thought out policies, we furnish data for a great deliberative body like the Congress to enable it to form a well-informed opinion. The Congress cannot express national opinion with any definiteness, unless at least some of us have already firm views about a particular course of conduct. If all suspended their opinion, the Congress must necessarily suspend its own.

There are always three classes of people in an institution: Those who have favourable views on a given policy, those who have fixed but unfavourable views on it and those who hold no fixed views. The Congress decides for this third and large group. I hold fixed views on non-co-

operation. I believe that if we are to make anything of the reforms, we will have to create a pure, clean and elevating atmosphere instead of the present foetid, unclean and debasing atmosphere to work them in. I believe that our first duty is to compel justice from the Imperial Government in regard to the Khilafat and the Punjab. In both these matters injustice is being sustained by untruth and insolence. I therefore consider it to be the duty of the nation to purge the Government of the uncleanness before they can co-operate with each other. Even opposition or obstruction is possible where there is mutual respect and confidence. At the present moment the governing authority has no respect for us or our feelings, we have no faith in it. In these circumstances co-operation is a crime. Holding these strong views I can serve the Congress and the country only by reducing them to practice and thus affording to the Congress material for forming an opinion.

For me to suspend non-co-operation would be to prove untrue to the Mussalman brethren. They have their own religious duty to perform. Their religious sentiment has been deeply hurt by a total disregard of laws, of justice and their own promises by British ministers. The Mussalmans must take action now. They cannot await the Congress decision. They can only expect the Congress to ratify their action and share their sorrows and their burdens. Their action cannot be delayed till the Congress has decided on a policy nor can their course be altered by an adverse decision of the Congress unless their action is otherwise found to be an error. The Khilafat is a matter of conscience with them. And in matters of conscience the law of majority has no place.

CRUSADE AGAINST NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 4, 1920.)

I have most carefully read the manifesto addressed by Sir Narayan Chandavarkar and others dissuading the people from joining the non-co-operation movement. I had expected to find some solid argument against non-co-operation, but to my great regret I have found in it nothing but distortion (no doubt unconscious) of the great religions and history. The manifesto says that 'non-co-operation is deprecated by the religious tenets and traditions of our mother-land, nay, of all the religions that have saved and elevated the human race.' I venture to submit that the Bhagwad Gita is a gospel of non-co-operation between forces of darkness and those of light. If it is to be literally interpreted, Arjun representing a just cause was enjoined to engage in bloody warfare with the unjust Kauravas. Tulsidas advises the *Sant* (the good) to shun the *Asant* (the evil-doers). The Zend Avesta represents a perpetual dual between Ormuzd and Ahrman, between whom there is no compromise. To say of the Bible that it taboos non-co-operation is not to know Jesus, a prince among passive resisters, who uncompromisingly challenged the might of the Saducees and the Pharisees, and for the sake of truth did not hesitate to divide sons from the parents. And what did the Prophet of Islam do? He non-co-operated in Mecca in a most active manner so long as his life was not in danger and wiped the dust of Mecca off his feet when he found that he and his followers

might have uselessly to perish, and fled to Medina and returned when he was strong enough to give battle to his opponents. The duty of non-co-operation with unjust men and kings is as strictly enjoined by all the religions as is the duty of co-operation with just men and kings. Indeed most of the scriptures of the world seem even to go beyond non-co-operation and prefer violence to effeminate submission to a wrong. The Hindu religious tradition, of which the manifesto speaks, clearly proves the duty of non-co-operation. ¶Prahlaḍ dissociated himself from his father, Meerabai from her husband, Bibhishan from his brutal brother.'

The manifesto speaking of the secular aspect says, 'the history of nations affords no instance to show that it (meaning non-co-operation) has, when employed, succeeded and done good.' One most recent instance of brilliant success of non-co-operation is that of General Botha who boycotted Lord Milner's reformed councils and thereby procured a perfect constitution for his country. The Dukhobours of Russia offered non-co-operation, and a handful though they were, their grievances so deeply moved the civilized world that Canada offered them a home where they form a prosperous community. In India, instances can be given by the dozen, in which in little principalities the rayats when deeply grieved by their chiefs have cut off all connection with them and bent them to their will. I know of no instance in history where well managed non-co-operation has failed.

Hitherto I have given historical instances of bloodless non-co-operation. I will not insult the intelligence of the reader by citing historical instances of non-co-opera-

tion combined with violence, but I am free to confess that there are on record as many successes as failures in violent non-co-operation. And it is because I know this fact that I have placed before the country a non-violent scheme in which, if at all worked satisfactorily, success is a certainty and in which non-response means no harm. For if even one man non-co-operates, say, by resigning some office, he has gained, not lost. That is its ethical or religious aspect. For its political result naturally it requires polymerous support. I fear therefore no disastrous result from non-co-operation save for an outbreak of violence on the part of the people whether under provocation or otherwise. I would risk violence a thousand times than risk the emasculation of a whole race.

RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY FOR N. C. O.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*August 25, 1920.*)

It is not without the greatest reluctance that I engage in a controversy with so learned a leader like Sir Narayan Chandavarkar. But in view of the fact that I am the author of the movement of non-co-operation, it becomes my painful duty to state my views even though they are opposed to those of the leaders whom I look upon with respect. I have just read during my travels in Malabar Sir Narayan's rejoinder to my answer* to the Bombay manifesto against non-co-operation. I regret to have to say that the rejoinder leaves me unconvinced. He and I

* See page 318.

seem to read the teachings of the Bible, the Gita and the Koran from different standpoints or we put different interpretations on them. We seem to understand the words Ahimsa, politics and religion differently. I shall try my best to make clear my meaning of the common terms and my reading of the different religions.

At the outset let me assure Sir Narayan that I have not changed my views on Ahimsa. I still believe that man not having been given the power of creation does not possess the right of destroying the meanest creature that lives. The prerogative of destruction belongs solely to the creator of all that lives. I accept the interpretation of Ahimsa, namely, that it is not merely a negative state of harmlessness but it is a positive state of love, of doing good even to the evil-doer. But it does not mean helping the evil-doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence. On the contrary, love, the active state of Ahimsa, requires you to resist the wrong-doer by dissociating yourself from him even though it may offend him or injure him physically." Thus if my son lives a life of shame, I may not help him to do so by continuing to support him; on the contrary, my love for him requires me to withdraw all support from him although it may mean even his death. (And the same love imposes on me the obligation of welcoming him to my bosom when he repents. But I may not by physical force compel my son to become good. That in my opinion is the moral of the story of the Prodigal Son.)

Non-co-operation is not a passive state, it is an intensely active state—more active than physical resistance or violence. Passive resistance is a misnomer.

Non-co-operation in the sense used by me must be non-violent and therefore neither punitive nor vindictive nor based on malice, ill-will or hatred. It follows therefore that it would be sin for me to serve General Dyer and co-operate with him to shoot innocent men. But it will be an exercise of forgiveness or love for me to nurse him back to life, if he was suffering from a physical malady. I cannot use in this context the word co-operation as Sir Narayan would perhaps use it. I would co-operate a thousand times with this Government to wean it from its career of crime, but I will not for a single moment co-operate with it to continue that career. And I would be guilty of wrong-doing if I retained a title from it or "a service under it or supported its ^{lit} ~~for~~ courts or schools." Better for me a beggar's bowl than the richest possession from hands stained with the blood of the innocents of Jallianwala. Better by far a warrant of imprisonment than honeyed words from those who have wantonly wounded the religious sentiment of my seventy million brothers.

My reading of the Gita is diametrically opposed to Sir Narayan's. I do not believe that the Gita teaches violence for doing good. It is pre-eminently a description of the duel that goes on in our own hearts. The Divine Author has used a historic incident for inculcating the lesson of doing one's duty even at the peril of one's life. It inculcates performance of duty irrespective of the consequences, for we mortals, limited by our physical frames, are incapable of controlling actions save our own. The Gita distinguishes between the powers of light and darkness and demonstrates their incompatibility.

Jesus, in my humble opinion, was a prince among politicians.' He did render unto Caesar that which was Caesar's. He gave the devil his due. He ever shunned him and is reported never once to have yielded to his incantations. The politics of his time consisted in securing the welfare of the people by teaching them not to be seduced by the trinkets of the priests and the pharisees. The latter then controlled and moulded the life of the people. To-day the system of government is so devised as to affect every department of our life. It threatens our very existence. If therefore we want to conserve the welfare of the nation, we must religiously interest ourselves in the doings of the governors and exert a moral influence on them by insisting on their obeying the laws of morality. General Dyer did produce a 'moral effect' by an act of butchery. Those, who are engaged in forwarding the movement of non-co-operation, hope to produce a moral effect by a process of self-denial, self-sacrifice and self-purification. It surprises me that Sir Narayan should speak of General Dyer's massacre in the same breath as acts of non-co-operation. I have done my best to understand his meaning, but I am sorry to confess that I have failed.

THE DUTY OF MEN OF RELIGION

(August 18, 1920.)

Kings' own conscience trained and watched by fearless, holy priests, was considered a sufficient guarantee of just government in ancient India. Priests used to assume

the role of guardians and representatives of the people; their decisions were accepted by kings as final. Such correctives of unjust government are also found in European history. An incident, where a king submitted to the just dictates of a fearless, holy priest, would well contrast with the narrow policy of our Government, who with their false ideas of prestige, disregard the wishes of a whole nation in connection with the Punjab tragedy.

Theodosius the Great, the Emperor of the Eastern Empire, in 390 A. D. received intelligence that one of his lieutenants was cruelly murdered by the people of Thessalonica. He got impatient of the dilatory forms of a judicial inquiry and ordered that the blood of his lieutenant should be expiated by the blood of the guilty people. His officers, however, inviting the people to witness games, massacred, without discrimination of innocence or guilt, a large number from the gathering. The news of this massacre reached the ears of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. Filled with grief and horror he retired into the country 'to indulge his grief and to avoid the presence of Theodosius.' But satisfied that a timid silence would render him an accomplice of the king's guilt, he represented in a private letter the enormity of the crime. He also had a personal interview with Theodosius when the archbishop, in the tone and language of an ambassador of Heaven, declared that private contrition (which the emperor had already resolved to do) was not sufficient to atone for a public fault or to appease the justice of the offended Deity. Theodosius accepted the rigorous conditions of peace and pardon laid down by Ambrose, and stripped of the ensigns of royalty the emperor solicited, with tears

and sighs, the pardon of his sins. Upon this the great historian, Gibbon, rightly remarks: "The example of this emperor may prove the beneficial influence of those principles which could force a monarch, exalted above the apprehension of human punishment, to respect the laws and ministers of an invisible judge."

Besides illustrating the duty of a dutiful ruler, this instance also shows how an undaunted subject can resent a cruel act of his sovereign. Ambrose refused to admit Theodosius to the Eucharist till he had done public penance. This is one of the many instances even from European history showing how a Christian refused to co-operate with his unjust sovereign till the latter had purged himself of his sin.

*

*

*

If a sovereign persists in his injustice, the duty of his subject, Christian, Hindu or Mussalman, is clear. This duty has been bravely performed by men of different religions, of different ages and in different countries. In Europe or in India, it was more difficult to perform this duty in a monarchical period than now. But a spirited soul bends to no circumstances, when once the duty is clear. An incident from the Mahratta history illustrates it.

When Narainrao Peshwa was murdered, his uncle and successor Raghunathrao was suspected of having a hand in the crime. The ministers including Ram Shastree, chief judge of the court, resolved that it was on every account advisable to support Raghunathrao's right to the succession as long as there was even the least evidence in his favour. But when Ram Shastree ascert-

ained from Raghunathrao himself that he had participated in the fall of his nephew, the undaunted Shastree declared to Ragunathrao, "I will neither accept of employment, nor enter Poona, whilst you preside in the administration." 'He kept his word, and retired to a sequestered village near Waee', says Grant Duff.

It is men of Ram Shastree's stuff that render a government civilized and adorn the service they belong to.

MORE OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 18, 1920.)

Swadeshmitran is one of the most influential Tamil dailies of Madras. It is widely read. Every thing appearing in its columns is entitled to respect. The Editor has suggested some practical difficulty in the way of non-cooperation. I would therefore like, to the best of my ability, to deal with them.

I do not know where the information has been derived from that I have given up the last two stages of non-cooperation. What I have said is that they are a distant goal. I abide by it. I admit that all the stages are fraught with some danger, but the last two are fraught with the greatest—the last most of all. The stages have been fixed with a view to running the least possible risk. The last two stages will not be taken up unless the committee has attained sufficient control over the people to warrant the belief that the laying down of arms or suspension of taxes will, humanly speaking, be free from an outbreak of

violence on the part of the people. I do entertain the belief that it is possible for the people to attain the discipline necessary for taking the two steps. When once they realise that violence is totally unnecessary to bend an unwilling government to their will and that the result can be obtained with certainty by dignified non-co-operation, they will cease to think of violence even by way of retaliation. The fact is that hitherto we have not attempted to take concerted and disciplined action from the masses. Some day, if we are to become truly a self-governing nation, that attempt has to be made. The present, in my opinion, is a propitious movement. Every Indian feels the insult to the Punjab as a personal wrong, every Mussalman resents the wrong done to the Khilafat. There is therefore a favourable atmosphere for expecting cohesive and restrained movement on the part of the masses.

So far as response is concerned, I agree with the editor that the quickest and the largest response is to be expected in the matter of suspension of payment of taxes, but as I have said, so long as the masses are not educated to appreciate the value of non-violence even whilst their holdings are being sold, so long must it be difficult to take up the last stage in any appreciable extent.

I agree too that a sudden withdrawal of the military and the police will be a disaster if we have not acquired the ability to protect ourselves against robbers and thieves. But I suggest that when we are ready to call out the military and the police on an extensive scale, we would find ourselves in a position to defend ourselves. If the police and the military resign from patriotic motives,

I would certainly expect them to perform the same duty as national volunteers, not as hirelings but as willing protectors of the life and liberty of their countrymen. The movement of non-co-operation is one of automatic adjustment. If the Government schools are emptied, I would certainly expect national schools to come into being. If the lawyers as a whole suspended practice, they would devise arbitration courts and the nation will have expeditious and cheaper method of settling private disputes and awarding punishment to the wrong doer. I may add that the Khilafat Committee is fully alive to the difficulty of the task and is taking all the necessary steps to meet the contingencies as they arise.

Regarding the leaving of civil employment, no danger is feared, because no one will leave his employment, unless he is in a position to find support for himself and family either through friends or otherwise.

Disapproval of the proposed withdrawal of students betrays, in my humble opinion, lack of appreciation of the true nature of non-co-operation. It is true enough that we pay the money wherewith our children are educated. But when the agency imparting the education has become corrupt, we may not employ it without partaking of the agent's corruption. When students leave schools or colleges I hardly imagine that the teachers will fail to perceive the advisability of themselves resigning. But even if they do not, money can hardly be allowed to count where honour or religion is the stake.

As to the boycott of the councils, it is not the entry of the moderate or any other persons that matters so much as the entry of those who believe in non-co-operation.

You may not co-operate at the top and non-co-operate at the bottom. A councillor cannot remain in the council and ask the *gumasta* who cleans the council table to resign.

AN ADVICE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*December 1, 1920.*)

The following anonymous advice has been received by me :—

“ Mahatma,

“ Listen to a woman's advice. Reject it, but ponder over it well before you reject, and pray to the All-Wise fervently for wisdom and inspiration. Concentration is strength, diversion is weakness. Limit your scope of Non-co-operation to only three things : foreign goods, the police service, and the army. Thereby you will remove all internal differences and strengthen our cause and speed *Swaraj*. Confine your efforts chiefly, not wholly, to the border tribes, the Sikhs, the Punjabis, the Dogras, and especially the Gurkhas. Work through secret societies as history teaches, and not by flourish of trumpets. Do not threaten but strike, and strike at the root and not at the branches. May God speed you and our cause to success.—Mrs. F.”

The letter is undated. It is evidently not a woman's letter. It is too unwomanly to be a woman's letter. The women of India are infinitely braver than the letter would make them out to be. The writer writes about God but is possessed with the fear of the British bayonet and would therefore gladly make use of the Sikh and the Gurkha steel. He has ill-digested the gospel of non-co-operation. In his fearsomeness, he does not see that to exchange British brute force for any other brute force is no real remedy for the ills of India. And if it is

the steel that is to decide the issue, it must be not Sikh or Gurkha steel, it must be all-India steel. That is the one supreme lesson that Europe teaches. If it is brute force that is to rule, then the millions of India must learn the art of war, or must for ever remain prostrate at the feet of him who wields the sword, whether he is *paradesi* or *swadeshi*. The millions must remain 'dumb driven cattle.' Non-co-operation is an attempt to awaken the masses to a sense of their dignity and power. This can only be by enabling them to realise that they need not fear brute force, if they would but know the soul within.

The Dogras, the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, and the other martial races of India, we do want, not for the purpose of giving battle to the British soldier, but for the purpose of refraining from helping the British soldier to subjugate us. We want our military classes to realise that they only perpetuate their own and our slavery by wielding the sword at the dictation of a British officer. And that time will come when the school the writer represents has become defunct, and when the military classes have also understood the necessity of non-violence.

The writer makes me suspicious about himself when he asks us to concentrate our attention on foreign goods, the police, and the army. He would thus secure internal unity by waiving all sacrifice, *i.e.*, purification by the very classes who have hitherto led public opinion—whereas the whole battle of non-co-operation rages round these very classes. It may, for the time being, appear to have struck a discordant note, but,

in fact, it will achieve real unity after the process of purification is over.

The writer has moreover missed the grand result already achieved by the absolute openness of our battle. In my opinion, the public has never expressed itself so fearlessly and openly as at present. It has almost lost the fear of the highly artificial law of sedition. When the writer talks of secret societies, he seems to talk of a bygone age. You cannot raise this great nation to its full height by the unclean methods of secrecy. We must, by boldly carrying on our campaign in the light of the blazing sun of openness, disarm the secret and demoralising police department. Non-co-operation is nothing if it does not strike at the root. And you strike at the root when you cease to water this deadly tree of the British Government by means of open and honourable non-co-operation. The writer takes the name of God in vain, when he advocates in the same breath the secret ways of Satan.

SOME DOUBTS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 15, 1920.)

Babu Janakdharī Prasad was a staunch co-worker with me in Champaran. He has written a long letter setting forth his reasons for his belief that India has a great mission before her, and that she can achieve her purpose only by non-violent non-co-operation. But he has doubts which he would have me answer publicly. The letter being long, I am withholding. But the doubts

are entitled to respect and I must endeavour to answer them. Here they are as framed by Babu Janakdhari Prasad.

(a) Is not the non-co-operation movement creating a sort of race-hatred between Englishmen and Indians, and is it in accordance with the Divine plan of universal love and brotherhood ?

(b) Does not the use of words "devilish," "satanic," etc., savour of unbrotherly sentiment and incite feelings of hatred ?

(c) Should not the non-co-operation movement be conducted on strictly non-violent and non-emotional lines both in speech and action ?

(d) Is there no danger of the movement going out of control and leading to violence ?

As to (a), I must say that the movement is not 'creating' race-hatred. It certainly gives, as I have already said, disciplined expression to it. You cannot eradicate evil by ignoring it. It is because I want to promote universal brotherhood that I have taken up non-co-operation so that, by self-purification, India may make the world better than it is.

As to (b), I know that the words 'satanic' and 'devilish' are strong, but they relate the exact truth. They describe a system not persons. We are bound to hate evil, if we would shun it. But by means of non-co-operation we are able to distinguish between the evil and the evil-doer. I have found no difficulty in describing a particular activity of a brother of mine to be devilish, but I am not aware of having harboured any hatred about him. Non-co-operation teaches us to love our fellow-men in spite of their faults, not by ignoring or overlooking them.

As to (c), the movement is certainly being conducted on strictly non-violent lines. That all non-co-operators have not yet thoroughly imbibed the doctrine is true. But that just shows what an evil legacy we have inherited. Emotion there is in the movement. And it will remain. A man without emotion is a man without feeling.

As to (d), there certainly is danger of the movement becoming violent. But we may no more drop non-violent non-co-operation because of its dangers, than we may stop freedom because of the danger of its abuse.

A GOSPEL OF HATE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 29, 1920.)

The *Indian Interpreter* has much to say against non-co-operation. I do wish editors will try to understand public questions before dealing with them. The *Indian Interpreter* is a Christian journal and one has a right to expect a fair knowledge of subjects handled in a responsible journal devoted to religious matters. "India will never", says the *Interpreter*, "attain unity by means of a common hate. That appears, as far as an onlooker can judge, to be the means to which Mr. Gandhi, the idealist, has surrendered himself." Mr. Stokes, who has endeavoured to study the movement as an onlooker says that it is not based on hate. I have said so myself. But prejudices die hard. And in these days of mad rush to which modern journalism is making the largest contribution,

people feed their prejudices, unconsciously it may be, by coming to hasty conclusions on insufficient data.

A Common Danger.—It is a common danger, a common affliction, that is binding Hindus and Mussalmans. I know no purifier so great as affliction. "Adversity makes strange bed fellows". With us it has knit together not strangers but neighbours, sons of the same soil.

The *Interpreter* is however more to the point in asking, "Does Mr. Gandhi hold without hesitation or reserve that British rule in India is altogether evil and that the people of India are to be taught so to regard it? He must hold it to be so evil that the wrongs it does outweigh the benefits it confers, for only so is non-co-operation to be justified at the bar of conscience or of Christ." My answer is emphatically in the affirmative. So long as I believed that the sum total of the energy of the British Empire was good, I clung to it despite what I used to regard as temporary aberrations. I am not sorry for having done so. But having my eyes opened, it would be sin for me to associate myself with the Empire unless it purges itself of its evil character. I write this with sorrow and I should be pleased if I discovered that I was in error and that my present attitude was a reaction. The continuous financial drain, the emasculation of the Punjab and the betrayal of the Muslim sentiment constitute, in my humble opinion, a threefold robbery of India. 'The blessings' of *Pax Britannica*, I reckon therefore, to be a curse. We would have at least remained like the other nations brave men and women, instead of feeling as we do so utterly helpless, if we had no British rule imposing on us an armed peace. 'The blessing' of roads and railways is a

return no self-respecting nation would accept for its degradation. The 'blessing' of education is proving one of the greatest obstacles in our progress towards freedom. The fact is that non-co-operation by reason of its non-violence has become a religious and purifying movement. It is daily bringing strength to the nation, showing it its weak spots and the remedy for removing them. It is a movement of self-reliance. It is the mightiest force for revolutionising opinion and stimulating thought. It is a movement of self-imposed suffering and therefore possesses automatic checks against extravagance or impatience. The capacity of the nation for suffering regulates its advance towards freedom. It isolates the forces of evil by refraining from participation in it, in any shape or form.

A Cry from Fiji.—The letter published elsewhere lends powerful support to the movement. My esteemed correspondent analyses the reasons for our countrymen having returned in such large numbers as they have done and are still doing. In Fiji, not even the women were immune from prosecutions and imprisonments. Of course there is no reason why the sex should secure immunity from punishment for a proved crime. But all the accounts received from Fiji go to prove that the prosecutions of Fiji were very like those of the Punjab—a method of terrorism adopted for crushing the spirit of a people struggling to be somewhat free. I fear that we shall bring little comfort to our distressed countrymen in Fiji by sending a Congress deputation. I so thoroughly distrust the Fiji Government. It will afford no facility to the deputation for conducting an inquiry. The deputation may even be

stopped by the Indian Government from leaving the Indian shore. For me the Fiji trouble affords more reason for quickening the non-co-operation movement. Meanwhile we must do everything we can to look after those who may return to India. The returning Indians must not be left to shift for themselves, feel disappointed, and then think of going back to Fiji. I am glad therefore that the men who have returned are being looked after by Mr. A. V. Thakkar who has just finished his labours in Puri, and Mr. Banarasidas of Shantiniketan who is assisting Mr. Andrews in his humanitarian work.

‘ONE STEP ENOUGH FOR ME’

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 29, 1920.)

Mr. Stokes is a Christian who wants to follow the light that God gives him. He has adopted India as his home. He is watching the non-co-operation movement from the Kotagiri hills where he is living in isolation from the India of the plains, and serving the hillmen. He has contributed three articles on non-co-operation to the columns of the *Servant* of Calcutta and other papers. I had the pleasure of reading them during my Bengal tour. Mr. Stokes approves of non-co-operation but dreads the consequences that may follow complete success, *i. e.*, evacuation of India by the British. He conjures up before his mind a picture of India invaded by the Afghans from the North-West, plundered by the Gurkhas from the hills. For me I say with Cardinal Newman: ‘I do not ask to

see the distant scene ; one step enough for me.' The movement is essentially religious. The business of every god-fearing man is to dissociate himself from evil in total disregard of consequences. He must have faith in a good deed producing only a good result : that in my opinion is the Gita doctrine of work without attachment. God does not permit him to peep into the future. He follows truth although the following of it may endanger his very life. He knows that it is better to die in the way of God than to live in the way of Satan. Therefore whoever is satisfied that this Government represents the activity of Satan has no choice left to him but to dissociate himself from it.

However, let us consider the worst that can happen to India on a sudden evacuation of India by the British. What does it matter that the Gurkhas and the Pathans attack us ? Surely we would be better able to deal with their violence than we are with the continued violence, moral and physical, perpetrated by the present government. Mr. Stokes does not seem to eschew the use of physical force. Surely the combined labours of the Rajput, the Sikh and the Mussalman warrior in a united India may be trusted to deal with plunderers from any or all the sides. Imagine however the worst : Japan overwhelming us from the Bay of Bengal, the Gurkhas from the Hills, and the Pathans from the North-West. If we do not succeed in driving them out, we make terms with them and drive them out at the first opportunity. This will be a more manly course than a helpless submission to an admittedly wrongful state.

But I refuse to contemplate the dismal outlook. If the

movement succeeds through non-violent non-co-operation, and that is the supposition Mr. Stokes has started with, the English, whether they remain or retire, will do so as friends and under a well-ordered agreement as between partners. I still believe in the goodness of human nature, whether it is English or any other. I therefore do not believe that the English will leave in ‘a night’.

And do I consider the Gurkha and the Afghan being incorrigible thieves and robbers without ability to respond to purifying influences? I do not. If India returns to her spirituality, it will react upon the neighbouring tribes, she will interest herself in the welfare of these hardy but poor people, and even support them if necessary not out of fear but as a matter of neighbourly duty. She will have dealt with Japan simultaneously with the British. Japan will not want to invade India, if India has learnt to consider it a sin to use a single foreign article that she can manufacture within her own borders. She produces enough to eat, and her men and women can without difficulty manufacture enough cloth to cover their nakedness and protect themselves from heat and cold. We become prey to invasion if we excite the greed of foreign nations by dealing with them under a feeling dependence on them. We must learn to be independent of everyone of them.

Whether therefore we finally succeed through violence or non-violence, in my opinion the prospect is by no means so gloomy as Mr. Stokes has imagined. Any conceivable prospect is, in my opinion, less black than the present unmanly and helpless condition. And we cannot do better than following out fearlessly and with con-

fidence the open and honourable programme of non-violence and sacrifice that we have mapped for ourselves.

DID JESUS CO-OPERATE ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 19, 1921.)

DEAR MR. GANDHI,

Mr. Lyle has been here and he told me that you had been enquiring kindly about me. I thank you for your kind inquiries. Of course I have been following your activities with the greatest interest, but it grieves me to have to say that I do not and cannot approve of your Non-co-operation movement. I have been praying that God may show you your mistake and that He may use you—and us all—for the glory of His Holy Name, and for the real enduring welfare of the whole of India. From your many articles and speeches I have gathered that you attempt to justify your movement on the ground that if, in spite of argument and dissuasion, one's nearest and dearest even be seen pursuing a wrong course of action, one is bound to dissociate oneself from him or her lest one be charged with being an accomplice in the wrong-doing.

But surely, one fundamental doctrine of both the Christian and Hindu Scriptures points to quite a different course of conduct. Both tell us of Divine Incarnations, and though these differ in some respects, yet in each case the underlying idea is that when God, Who is Himself infinitely holy, saw the sin-begotten misery of men, He did not hold aloof from them but graciously stopped down and came to them to render help and to save their sin and its effects. Jesus Christ, the Holy and Undefiled One, did not refuse to work along with sinful men, but, on the contrary, while loathing all evil and scathingly denouncing it even in the great ones of His time, He freely and closely associated with all men, from the Pharisee down to the hated tax-gatherer of an alien government and the notorious sinner, and endeavoured, both by wise precept and loving example, to wean them from their wickedness and to win them to righteousness.

From this I gather that it is the obvious duty of all true patriots at the present time not to hold themselves aloof from a government unfairly denounced as "devilish" and "satanic", but to take every possible step (e. g. the encouraging of the new councils), to keep in touch with it and

endeavour to bring it round to what they consider a more righteous course of conduct. I am hoping and praying that as you were led to acknowledge your mistake of last year in the matter of Satyagrah, so God may open your eyes before it is too late and lead you from Non-co-operation to co-operation.

You are at liberty to use these few words in any way you like. With kind regards,

Rajkot, }
20-11-20. }

I am, yours sincerely,
G. GILLESPIE.

I print this letter without a word of alteration. I print it specially because it shows that in spite of ceaseless denunciation by me of the existing system of Government, I have the good fortune to retain the warm friendship of Britishers like the Rev. Gillespie. I know that he honestly believes what he says. He gives me credit for honesty of belief and purpose, yet we differ as poles asunder even in our interpretation of the Christian and the Hindu scriptures. Of the latter I can write with confidence, and I make bold to assert that it is the *duty* of a Hindu to dissociate himself from the evil-doer *i. e.*, to refrain from participating in or countenancing the evil in him. Prahlad dissociated himself from the evil done by his father. The divine Sita rejected the services tendered to her by Ravan, Bharat denounced the deeds of Kaikeyi, his mother, and rejected the throne wickedly secured for him by her. I can write of the Bible only with diffidence. But my reading of it has clearly confirmed the opinion derived from a reading of the Hindu scriptures. Jesus mixed with the publicans and the sinners neither as a dependent nor as a patron. He mixed with them to serve and to convert them to a life of truthfulness and purity. But he wiped the dust off

his feet of those places which did not listen to his word. I hold it to be my duty not to countenance a son who disgraces himself by a life of shame and vice. *Enlightened Non-co-operation is the expression of anguished love.* My esteemed correspondent mixes up dissociation from evil with dissociation from persons for service. Would Jesus have accepted gifts from the money changers, taken from them scholarships for His friends, and advanced loans to them to ply their nefarious traffic? Was His denunciation of hypocrites, Pharisees, and Sadducees merely in word? Or did He not actually invite the people to beware of them and shun them? But Mr. Gillespie thinks that I unfairly describe the Government to be satanic. Perhaps that alters our viewpoints. If I consider that I would be less than truthful if I did not describe as satanic a government which has been guilty of fraud, murder, and wanton cruelty; which still remains unrepentant and resorts to untruth to cover its guilt. I really believe I am performing the office of a friend by denouncing in precise language the pretensions of a government which has nothing to commend itself to the people under its charge.

THE INWARDNESS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 8, 1920.)

I commend to the attention of the readers of *Young India* the thoughtful letter received from Miss Anne Marie Peterson. Miss Peterson is a lady who has been

in India for some years and has closely followed Indian affairs. She is about to sever her connection with her Mission for the purpose of giving herself to education that is truly national.

I have not given the letter in full.* I have omitted all

* The following letter has been received by Mr. Gandhi from Miss Anne Marie Peterson of the Danish Mission in Madras. Most personal references have been omitted.—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I cannot thank you enough for your kindness and the way in which you received me and I feel that meeting more or less decided my future. I have thrown myself at the feet of India. At the same time I know that in Christ alone is my abode and I have no longing and no desire but to live Him, my crucified Saviour, and reveal Him for those with whom I come in contact. I just cling to His feet and pray with tears that I may not disgrace Him as we Christians have been doing by our behaviour in India. We go on crucifying Christ while we long to proclaim the Power of His resurrection by which He has conquered untruth and unrighteousness. If we who bear His name were true to Him, we would never bow ourselves before the powers of this world, but we would always be on the side of the poor, the suffering and the oppressed. But we are not, and therefore I feel myself under obligation not only to Christ but to India for His sake at this time of momentous importance for her future.

Truly it matters little what I, a lonely and insignificant person, may say or do. What is my protest against the common current the race to which I belong is taking and (what grieves me more,) which the missionary societies seem to follow? Even if a respectable number protested, it would not be of any use. Yet were I alone against the whole world, I must follow my conscience and my God.

I therefore cannot but smile when I see people saying you should have awaited the decision of the National Congress before starting the non-co-operation movement. You have a message for the country, and the Congress is the voice of the nation—its servant and not its master. A majority has no right simply because it is a majority.

But we must try to win the majority. And it is easy to see, that now the Congress is going to be with you. Would it have done so if you had kept quiet and not lent your voice to the feelings of the people? Would the Congress have known its mind? I think not.

personal references. But her argument has been left entirely untouched. The letter was not meant to be printed. But it being intrinsically important, I asked the writer for her permission, which she gladly gave, for printing it.

I publish it all the more gladly in that it enables me to show that the movement of non-co-operation is neither anti-Christian nor anti-English nor anti-European. It is a struggle between religion and irreligion, powers of light and powers of darkness.

It is my firm opinion that Europe to-day represents

I myself was in much doubt before I heard you. But you convinced me. Not that I can feel much on the question of the Khilafat I cannot. I can see what service you are doing to India, if you can prevent the Mahomedans from using the sword in order to take revenge and get their rights. I can see that if you unite the Hindus and the Mahomedans, it will be a master stroke. How I wish the Christian would also come forward and unite with you for the sake of their country and the honour not only of their Motherland but of Christ. I may not feel much for Turkey, but I feel for India, and I can see she (India) has no other way to protest against being trampled down and crushed than non-co-operation.

I also want you to know that many in Denmark and all over the world, yes, I am sure every true Christian, will feel with and be in sympathy with India in the struggle which is now going on. God forbid that in the the struggle between might and right, truth and untruth, the spirit and the flesh, there should be a division of races. There is not. The same struggle is going on all over the world. What does it matter then that we are a few? God is on our side.

Brute force often seems to get the upper hand but righteousness always has and always shall conquer, be it even through much suffering, and what may even appear to be a defect. Christ conquered, when the world crucified Him. Blessed are the meek; they shall inherit the earth.

When I read your speech given at Madras it struck me that it should be printed as a pamphlet in English, Tamil, Hindustani and all the most used languages and then spread to every nook and corner of India.

not the spirit of God or Christianity but the spirit of Satan. And Satan's successes are the greatest, when he appears with the name of God on his lips. Europe is to-day only nominally Christian. In reality, it is worshipping Mammon. 'It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom.' Thus really spoke Jesus Christ. His so-called followers measure their moral progress by their material possession. The very National Anthem of England is anti-Christian. Jesus who asked His followers to love their enemies even as themselves, could not have sung of His enemies, 'confound His enemies, frustrate their knavish tricks.' The last book that Dr. Wallace wrote set forth his deliberate conviction that the much vaunted advance of science had added not an inch to the moral stature of Europe. The last war

The non-co-operation movement once started must be worked so as to become successful. If it is not, I dread to think of the consequences. But you cannot expect it to win in a day or two. It must take time and you will not despair if you do not reach your goal in a hurry. For those who have faith there is no haste.

Now for the withdrawal of the children and students from Government schools, I think it a most important step. Taking the Government help, (even if it be your money they pay you back) we must submit to its scheme, its rules and regulations. India and we who love her have come to the conclusion that the education the foreign Government has given you is not healthy for India and can certainly never make for her real growth. This movement would lead to a spontaneous rise of national schools. Let them be a few but let them spring up through self-sacrifice. Only by indigenous education can India be truly uplifted. Why this appeals so much to me is perhaps because I belong to the part of the Danish people who started their own independent, indigenous national schools. The Danish Free Schools and Folk High Schools, of which you may have heard were started against the opposition and persecution of the State. The organisers won and thus have regenerated the nation. With my truly heart-felt thanks and prayers for you, I am, Yours Sincerely, Anne Marie.

however has shown, as nothing else has, the Satanic nature of the civilization that dominates Europe to-day. Every canon of public morality has been broken by the victors in the name of virtue. No lie has been considered too foul to be uttered. The motive behind every crime is not religious or spiritual, but grossly material. But the Mussalmans and the Hindus, who are struggling against the Government, have religion and honour as their motive. Even the cruel assassination† which has just shocked the country is reported to have a religious motive behind it. It is certainly necessary to purge religion of its excrescences, but it is equally necessary to expose the hollowness of moral pretensions on the part of those who prefer material wealth to moral gain. It is easier to wean an ignorant fanatic from his error than a confirmed scoundrel from his scoundrelism.

This, however, is no indictment against individuals or even nations. Thousands of individual Europeans are rising above their environment. I write of the tendency in Europe, as reflected in her present leaders. England through her leaders is insolently crushing Indian religious and national sentiment under her heels. England, under the false plea of self-determination, is trying to exploit the oil fields of Mesopotamia which she is almost to leave, because she has probably no choice. France through her leaders is lending her name to training cannibals as soldiers, and is shamelessly betraying her trust as a mandatory power by trying to kill the spirit of

† This refers to the assassination of Mr. Willoughby, I C.S., Deputy Commissioner, United Provinces, by a Mussalman.

THE POET'S ANXIETY

the Syrians. President Wilson has thrown on the scrap-heap his precious fourteen points.

It is this combination of evil forces, which India is really fighting through non-violent non-co-operation. And those like Miss Peterson, whether Christian or European, who feel that this error must be dethroned, can exercise the privilege of doing so by joining the non-co-operation movement. With the honour of Islam is bound up the safety of religion itself and with the honour of India is bound up the honour of every nation known to be weak.

THE POET'S ANXIETY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 1, 1921.)

The Poet of Asia as Lord Hardinge called Dr. Tagore, is fast becoming, if he has not already become, the Poet of the world. Increasing prestige has brought to him increasing responsibility. His greatest service to India must be his poetic interpretation of India's message to the world. The Poet is therefore sincerely anxious that India should deliver no false or feeble message in her name. He is naturally jealous of his country's reputation. He says he has striven hard to find himself in tune with the present movement. He confesses that he is baffled. He can find nothing for his lyre in the din and the bustle of Non-co-operation. In three forceful letters he has endeavoured to give expression to his misgivings, and he has come to the conclusion that Non-co-operation

YOUNG INDIA

dignified enough for the India of his vision, that it is a doctrine of negation and despair. He fears that it is a doctrine of separation, exclusiveness, narrowness and negation.

No Indian can feel anything but pride in the Poet's exquisite jealousy of India's honour. It is good that he should have sent to us his misgivings in language at once beautiful and clear.

In all humility I shall endeavour to answer the Poet's doubts. I may fail to convince him or the reader who may have been touched by his eloquence, but I would like to assure him and India that Non-co-operation in conception is not any of the things he fears, and he need have no cause to be ashamed of his country for having adopted Non-co-operation. If in actual application it appears in the end to have failed, it will be no more the fault of the doctrine than it would be of Truth if those who claim to apply it in practice do not appear to succeed. Non-co-operation may have come in advance of its time. India and the world must then wait, but there is no choice for India save between violence and Non-co-operation.

Nor need the Poet fear that Non-co-operation is intended to erect a Chinese wall between India and the West. On the contrary, Non-co-operation is intended to pave the way to a real, honourable and voluntary co-operation based on mutual respect and trust. The present struggle is being waged against compulsory co-operation, against one-sided combination, against the armed imposition of modern methods of exploitation masquerading under the name of civilisation.

Non-co-operation is a protest against an unwitting and unwilling participation in evil.

✓ The Poet's concern is largely about the students. He is of opinion that they should not have been called upon to give up Government schools before they had other schools to go to. Here I must differ from him. ✓ I have never been able to make a fetish of literary training. My experience has proved to my satisfaction that literary training by itself adds not an inch to one's moral height and that character building is independent of literary training. I am firmly of opinion that the Government schools have unmanned us, rendered us helpless and godless. They have filled us with discontent, and providing no remedy for the discontent, have made us despondent. They have made us what we were intended to become—clerks and interpreters. * A Government builds its prestige upon the apparently voluntary association of the governed. And if it was wrong to co-operate with the Government in keeping us slaves, we were bound to begin with those institutions in which our association appeared to be most voluntary. The youth of a nation are its hope. I hold that as soon as we discovered that the system of government was wholly, or mainly evil, it became sinful for us to associate our children with it.

It is no argument against the soundness of the proposition laid down by me, that the vast majority of the students went back after the first flush of enthusiasm. Their recantation is proof rather of the extent of our degradation than of the wrongness of the step. Experience has shown that the establishment of national schools has not

resulted in drawing many more students. The strongest and the truest of them came out without any national schools to fall back upon, and I am convinced that these first withdrawals are rendering service of the highest order.

But the Poet's protest against the calling out of the boys is really a corollary to his objection to the very doctrine of Non-co-operation. He has a horror of everything negative. His whole soul seems to rebel against the negative commandments of religion. I must give his objection in his own inimitable language. "R. in support of the present movement has often said to me that passion for rejection is a stronger power in the beginning than the acceptance of an ideal. Though I know it to be a fact, I cannot take it as a truth.....Brahma-vidya in India has for its object *Mukti* emancipation, while Buddhism has *Nirvana* extinction. *Mukti* draws our attention to the positive and *Nirvana* to the negative side of truth. Therefore he emphasised the fact of *dukkha* misery which had to be avoided and the Brahma-vidya emphasised the fact of *Ananda* joy which had to be attained " In these and kindred passages the reader will find the key to the Poet's mentality. In my humble opinion, rejection is as much an ideal as the acceptance of a thing. It is as necessary to reject untruth as it is to accept truth. All religions teach that two opposite forces act upon us and that the human endeavour consists in a series of eternal rejections and acceptances. Non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as co-operation with good. I venture to suggest that the Poet has done an unconscious injustice to Buddhism in discribing *Nirvana*

as merely a negative state. I make bold to say that *Mukti* emancipation is as much a negative state as *Nirvana*. Emancipation from or extinction of the bondage of the flesh leads to *Ananda* (eternal bliss). Let me close this part of my argument by drawing attention to the fact that the final word of the Upanishads (*Brahma-vidya*) is *Not. Neti* was the best description the authors of the Upanishads were able to find for *Brahman*.

I therefore think that the Poet has been unnecessarily alarmed at the negative aspect of Non-co-operation. We had lost the power of saying 'no'. It had become disloyal, almost sacrilegious to say 'no' to the Government. This deliberate refusal to co-operate is like the necessary weeding procees that a cultivator has to resort to before he sows. Weeding is as necessary to agriculture as sowing. Indeed, even whilst the crops are growing, the weeding fork, as every husbandman knows, is an instrument almost of daily use. The nation's Non-co-operation is an invitation to the Government to co-operate with it on its own terms as is every nation's right and every good Government's duty. Non-co-operation is the nation's notice that it is no longer satisfied to be in tutelage. The nation has taken to the harmless (for it), natural and religious doctrine of Non-co-operation in the place of the unnatural and irreligious doctrine of violence. And if India is ever to attain the Swaraj of the Poet's dream, she will do so only by non-violent Non-co-operation. Let him deliver his message of peace to the world, and feel confident that India through her Non-co-operation, if she remain true to her pledge, will have exemplified his message. Non-co-operation is intended to give the very

meaning to patriotism that the Poet is yearning after. An India prostrate at the feet of Europe can give no hope to humanity. An India awakened and free has a message of peace and goodwill to a groaning world. Non-co-operation is designed to supply her with a platform from which she will preach the message.

DIVIDE AND RULE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 20, 1921.)

Sir William Vincent's speech before the Legislative Assembly makes painful reading. I shall hope that he has been kept in utter darkness by his informants and that the speech is ignorant, not unscrupulous.

It is a plausible defence of the Government's policy of repression. It is a distortion or concoction of facts. It is an appeal to our cupidity and a misinterpretation of the motives of non-co-operationists.

He says that the declared object of non-co-operationists is paralysis of the Government and that "in their effort to achieve the object there is no source of discontent which they have not used." Now both these statements are half-truths. The primary object of non-co-operation is nowhere stated to be paralysis of the Government. The primary object is self-purification. Its direct result must be paralysis of a Government which lives on our vices and weaknesses. Similarly it is a dangerous half-truth to say that we have left no source of discontent unused. We could not help using sources of legitimate discon-

tent. But non-co-operationists have rigidly refrained from using any and every discontent, if only because we would weaken our cause if we did. The illustration of what I mean will be best seen from the refutation of the very next sentence which Sir William has spoken in support of his contention: "Wherever they find discord between employer and employee, there some agent or emissary of non-co-operation party proceeds at once to foster discontent and promote ill-feeling." This is not only untrue, but it is an incitement to the two to oppose Non-co-operation. The avowed policy of non-co-operation has been not to make political use of disputes between labour and capital. They have endeavoured to hold the balance evenly between the two—we would be fools if we wantonly set labour against capital. It would be just the way to play into the hands of a Government which would greatly strengthen its hold on the country by setting capitalists against labourers and *vice versa*. In Jharia, for instance, it was a non-co-operator who prevented an extending strike. The moderating influence in Calcutta was that of non-co-operators. The latter will not hesitate to advance the cause of strikers where they have a just grievance. They have ever refused to lend their assistance to unjust strikes. "Where there is a racial ill-feeling", declares Sir William Vincent, "these emissaries hurry on their evil errand." He must know that this is a false statement. There is a racial feeling between Englishmen and Indians. There is the memory of Jallianwala—an evergreen. But "these emissaries" have been veritable messengers of peace. They have everywhere restrained the fury of the

unthinking. And I make bold to say that but for the existence of the spirit of non-violence, there would have been more innocent blood spilt in spite of the threat of Dyerism and O'Dwyerism. Our fault has lain in refusing to lick the boot that's kicked, in withdrawing co-operation until there was frank repentance. Non-co-operators are to be blessed for turning the fury of an outraged people from Englishmen to the system they are called upon to administer.

But Sir William is nothing if he is not thorough in his attempt to divide and rule. He declaims: "Where there are quarrels between landlord and tenant—have we not seen this in the United Provinces—there again proceed these emissaries of evil to propagate unrest, and stir up disorder." Sir William should know that the tenant movement is under the control of Pundit Jawharlal Nehru whose one purpose regarding the tenants has been to educate them to be patient and calm. Sir William has simply attempted to set the landlords against the non-co-operation movement. Fortunately the landlords know as well as the tenants that, so long as they are just, they have nothing to fear from non-co-operators.

The movement, says Sir William, 'is purely destructive and so far as I have been able to ascertain, contains no element of constructive ability.' It is undoubtedly destructive in the sense that a surgeon who applies the knife to a diseased part may be said to make a destructive movement. This destructive movement bears in it the surest seed of construction as the surgeon's knife contains the seed of health. Is temperance destructive? Are national schools, springing up every-

where, destructive? Are the thousands of spinning wheels destructive of a nation's prosperity? They will destroy foreign domination whether it hails from Lancashire or is threatened from Japan.

Having attempted to set classes against masses, Sir William proceeds to paralyze both, with the feeling of helplessness and the fear of internal strife and aggression from without. Is Hindu-Muslim unity such flimsy stuff that we shall begin to quarrel as soon as the British guns are withdrawn from our shores? Were we sixty years ago less able to protect ourselves than we are now? Or is it not a fact that judged by the Western standard we were never so helpless as we now are? Self-government, as I have said before, connotes the power of self-protection, and a country which cannot protect itself is not prepared for immediate and complete self-government. In this one sentence Sir William has unwittingly condemned British rule and proved the necessity of immediate mending or ending of that rule. According to my method—the method of suffering or soul force,—the country is to-day prepared for self-protection. According to Sir William's standard, the reforms have nothing in them to enable India even in a hundred years to arm herself for defence against a combination of world powers. Judged by that standard, the reforms do forge stronger the chains that bind India and make her feel helpless. The speaker talks glibly of impending destruction of every vested interest. He needs to be reminded that the greatest vested interest of India—her self-sufficiency—was destroyed by this foreign domination and the speaker's plan will still further deepen India's poverty.

Even as Sir William has misrepresented non-co-operators' motives, so has he misconstrued their methods. We have not failed in our effort regarding the educated classes. I admit that the response in practice might have been greater from them. But I make bold to say that the vast majority of them are with us in spirit, though the flesh being weak, they are not able to make what from their point of view is a sacrifice. We have been trying to act on the masses from the commencement. We regard them as our main-stay, for it is they who have to attain Swaraj. It is neither the sole concern of the monied men nor that of the educated class. Both must subserve their interest in any scheme of Swaraj, and as soon as the masses have attained sufficient self-control and learnt mass discipline, we shall not hesitate if necessary to advise them to suspend payment of taxes to a Government that has never truly looked after their welfare and that has exploited and terrorised them every time they have shown the least symptom of rising against their exploitation.

Sir William has been extremely disingenuous in describing the Government's methods of dealing with non-co-operation. Defence of India Act, he will not use against men who have hurt nobody and who are restraining people from committing violence. But he is using ordinary statutes against them in an extraordinary manner under a licence given to him by non-co-operators who will not challenge orders in a court of law. He will not conciliate the malcontents by granting Swaraj, for that would lead to anarchy. He does not bother his head about the two things which have caused all the unrest and which have

acted like two active and corroding poisons in the Indian body—the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. He does not tell us what catastrophe is likely to befall India if the Khilafat promises were redeemed and the Punjab wound healed.

He has ornamented his extraordinary speech with an ungentlemanly and insinuating attack upon the Ali Brothers who are putting up a noble fight for Islam and India, and a still more ungentlemanly attack on a 'gentleman of the name of Yakub Hasan', and an ungracious reference to his Turkish wife.

As I have said it was painful for me to read the speech, still more painful to have to criticise it. I assure the reader that self-restrained as I am in language, the speech has been a severe strain upon my capacity for restraint. I have scored out many an adjective which I believe would accurately describe Sir William's performance. I am sorry.

IN DEFENCE OF MALAVIYAJI AND SHASTRIAR

BY M. K. GANDHI.

(October 27, 1920.)

To the Editor of *Young India*.

SIR,

Mahatma Gandhi in his article* headed "The Hallucination of Schools and Colleges" while discussing the non-co-operation programme *re* the withdrawal of students from schools and colleges, admitting that the movement has been called 'harmful' and 'opposed to the best interests of the country', says that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is its most un-

* See the next Section.

compromising opponent. Then he taxes himself to find out the reasons for this attitude of Panditji. We quote Mahatma Gandhi "The answer I have been able to find is that the latter do not consider the present government as an unmixed evil as the former do. In other words the opponents do not sufficiently realise the significance of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs." And further on he proceeds to say "It is unthinkable that Malaviyaji and Shastriar cannot feel the wrongs even as I do. And yet that is precisely my meaning." We assure Mahatma Gandhi that we have the most profound and sincere respect for him, but that would not blind us to the claims of others. We hold no brief for Messrs. Malaviyaji and Shastriar. They can take care of themselves. Panditji's brilliant speech in the Council, his touching appeal for funds for the 'Jallianwalla Bag Memorial' and his recent stirring speech at the Empire Theatre, Bombay, supply an emphatic refutation to the suggestion that Mahatma Gandhi, quite unconsciously no doubt, has made. Mr Shastriar's articles in the *Servant of India* and his speeches on the Punjab Tragedy also reveal the burning patriotism, somewhat softened by judicial mind of Mr. Gokhale's worthy successor. Both of these great men have sufficiently given vent to expressions of deep feeling in connection with the Khilafat wrong.

Mahatma Gandhi himself has said so much on the question of individual liberty and the importance of following one's conscience, that we can hardly believe that he would by any action of his, try to curtail the one, or silence the other. But that is what the article indirectly attempts to do. That there is ample scope for difference of opinion in the adoption of means to attain the end is conceivable, but that so great an individualist as Mahatma Gandhi should attempt, however remotely, to curtail the expression of different views, is not so easy to imagine.

In conclusion, we appeal to Mahatma Gandhi not to make such equivocal statements, we appeal to the Modern Buddha not to excite emotions, to base his arguments on reason alone and trust he will see the impropriety of the statements he has made and will hasten to make reparation for the same. We trust Mahatma Gandhi will allow us the same honesty of conviction and freedom of opinion as Mahatma Gandhi claims for himself, though we have the misfortune to differ from him.—

Yours etc., "Swadeshis"

I gladly publish this letter. I honour the writers for their defence of the two great patriots. I wish they had permitted me to publish their names. Let me however

inform the reader that they are Gujaratis. And it is a matter of pride to me that Gujaratis would resent like every one else any aspersion upon the patriotism of either Malaviyaji or Shastriji. But I hasten to assure these friends that they will not be able to outdo me in the race for honouring the two patriots. For the time being we differ in our views on matters of highest importance. I have endeavoured honestly to find out the reason for the difference and have come to the conclusion that they cannot feel as strongly as I do, the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. Feelings are measured by acts, not by words. Their diagnosis is different from mine. From the two wrongs I deduce that I am to expect nothing good from this Government. Not so they. Therefore, whilst for them association with the Government is possible, for me it is impossible unless it repents of its sins. Two surgeons may describe a particular disease by the same name and yet one may prescribe mere ointment and the other a dangerous surgical operation. There need not be on that account any want of respect ascribed to the one who resorts to an operation. And if the other were to seek causes of difference in the methods of treatment he would be entitled to say and be justified in saying that the one who prescribed the ointment treatment could not have realised the desperate nature of the disease though he described it by the same name. I wish to assure the writers further that in my statement of the case there is no equivocation. Nor is there any desire on my part to curtail any one's liberty, or silence the voice of conscience, least of the two patriots. On the contrary I have humility enough to own that though I *feel* sure that

my diagnosis and method are both correct, *may* be wrong. And when I *find* that they are, I shall be quick enough to acknowledge my mistake. Lastly let me assure these friends that I have made it my business in life not to appeal to emotions, that is, excite passions but to put the most abstruse truths in simplest terms so that the reason even of the illiterate masses may comprehend.

RIDICULE REPLACING REPRESSION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*September 1, 1920.*)

Had His Excellency the Viceroy not made it impossible by his defiant attitude on the Punjab and the Khilafat, I would have tendered him hearty congratulations for substituting ridicule for repression in order to kill a movement distasteful to him. For, torn from its context and read by itself, His Excellency's discourse on non-co-operation is unexceptionable. It is a symptom of translation from savagery to civilization. Pouring ridicule on one's opponent is an approved method in civilized politics. And if the method is consistently continued, it will mark an important improvement upon the official barbarity of the Punjab. His interpretation of Mr. Montagu's statement about the movement is also not open to any objection whatsoever. Without doubt a government has the right to use sufficient force to put down an actual outbreak of violence.

But I regret to have to confess that this attempt to pour ridicule on the movement, read in conjunction with the

sentiments on the Punjab and the Khilafat preceding the ridicule, seems to show that His Excellency has made it a virtue of necessity. He has not finally abandoned the method of terrorism and frightfulness, but he finds the movement being conducted in such an open and truthful manner that any attempt to kill it by violent repression would expose him not only to ridicule but contempt of all right-thinking men.

Let us however examine the adjectives used by His Excellency to kill the movement by laughing at it. It is 'futile', 'ill-advised', 'intrinsically inane', 'unpractical', 'visionary.' He has rounded off the adjectives by describing the movement as 'most foolish of all foolish schemes.' His Excellency has become so impatient of it that he has used all his vocabulary for showing the magnitude of the ridiculous nature of non-co-operation.

Unfortunately for His Excellency the movement is likely to grow with ridicule as it is certain to flourish on repression. No vital movement can be killed except by the impatience, ignorance or laziness of its authors. A movement cannot be 'inane' that is conducted by men of action as I claim the members of the Non-co-operation Committee are. It is hardly 'unpractical,' seeing that if the people respond, every one admits that it will achieve the end. At the same time it is perfectly true that if there is no response from the people, the movement will be popularly described as 'visionary.' It is for the nation to return an effective answer by organized non-co-operation and change ridicule into respect. Ridicule is like repression. Both give place to respect when they fail to produce the intended effect.

THE VICEREGAL PRONOUNCEMENT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*September 1, 1920.*)

It may be that having lost faith in His Excellency's probity and capacity to hold the high office of Viceroy of India, I now read his speeches with a biased mind but the speech His Excellency delivered at the time of opening of the council shows to me a mental attitude which makes association with him or his Government impossible for self-respecting men.

The remarks on the Punjab mean a flat refusal to grant redress. He would have us to 'concentrate on the problems of the immediate future'! The immediate future is to compel repentance on the part of the Government on the Punjab matter. Of this there is no sign. On the contrary, His Excellency resists the temptation to reply to his critics, meaning thereby that he has not changed his opinion on the many vital matters affecting the honour of India. He is 'content to leave the issues to the verdict of history'. Now this kind of language, in my opinion, is calculated further to inflame the Indian mind. Of what use can a favourable verdict of history be to men who have been wronged and who are still under the heels of officers who have shown themselves utterly unfit to hold offices of trust and responsibility? The plea for co-operation is, to say the least, hypocritical in the face of the determination to refuse justice to the Punjab. Can a patient who is suffering from an intolerable ache be soothed by the most

tempting dishes placed before him. Will he not consider it mockery on the part of the physician who so tempted him without curing him of his pain ?

His Excellency is, if possible, even less happy on the Khilafat. "So far as any Government could", says this trustee for the nation, "we pressed upon the Peace Conference the views of Indian Moslems. But notwithstanding our efforts on their behalf we are threatened with a campaign of non-co-operation, because, forsooth, the Allied Powers found themselves unable to accept the contentions advanced by Indian Moslems." This is most misleading if not untruthful. His Excellency knows that the peace terms are not the work of the Allied Powers. He knows that Mr. Lloyd George is the prime author of terms and that the latter has never repudiated his responsibility for them. He has with amazing audacity justified them in spite of his considered pledge to the Moslems of India regarding Constantinople, Thrace and the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor. It is not truthful to saddle responsibility for the terms on the Allied Powers when Great Britain alone has promoted them. The offence of the Viceroy becomes greater when we remember that he admits the justness of the Muslim claim. He could not have pressed it if he did not admit its justice.

I venture to think that His Excellency by his pronouncement on the Punjab has strengthened the nation in its effort to seek a remedy to compel redress of the two wrongs before it can make anything of the so-called Reforms.

NON-CO-OPERATION EXPLAINED *

A TALK WITH MR. GANDHI

(August 18, 1920.)

A representative of this journal called on Mr. M. K. Gandhi yesterday at his temporary residence in the Pursewalkum High Road† for an interview on the subject of non-co-operation. Mr. Gandhi who has come to Madras on a tour to some of the principal Muslim centres in Southern India, was busy with a number of workers discussing his programme ; but he expressed his readiness to answer questions on the chief topic which is agitating Muslims and Hindus.

"After your experience of the Satyagraha agitation last year, Mr. Gandhi, are you still hopeful and convinced of the wisdom of advising non-co-operation?"—"Certainly."

"How do you consider conditions have altered since the Satyagraha movement of last year?"—"I consider that people are better disciplined now than they were before. In this I include even the masses whom I have had opportunities of seeing in large numbers in various parts of the country."

"And you are satisfied that the masses understand the spirit of Satyagraha?"—"Yes"

"And that is why you are pressing on with the programme of non-co-operation?"—"Yes. Moreover, the danger that attended the civil disobedience part of Satyagraha does not apply to non-co-operation, because in non-co-operation we are not taking up civil disobedience

* From the *Madras Mail*.

† In Madras.

of laws as a mass movement. The result hitherto has been most encouraging. For instance, people in Sindh and Delhi, in spite of the irritating restrictions upon their liberty by the authorities, have carried out the Committee's instructions in regard to the Seditious Meetings Proclamation and to the prohibition of posting placards on the walls which we hold to be inoffensive but which the authorities consider to be offensive."

"What is the pressure which you expect to bring to bear on the authorities if co-operation is withdrawn?"—"I believe, and everybody must grant, that no Government can exist for a single moment without the co-operation of the people, willing or forced, and if people suddenly withdraw their co-operation in every detail, the Government will come to a stand-still."

"But is there not a big 'If' in it?"—"Certainly there is."

"And how do you propose to succeed against the big 'If'?"—"In my plan of campaign expediency has no room. If the Khilafat movement has really permeated the masses and the classes, there must be adequate response from the people."

"But are you not begging the question?"—"I am not begging the question, because so far as the data before me go, I believe that the Muslims keenly feel the Khilafat grievance. It remains to be seen whether their feeling is intense enough to evoke in them the measure of sacrifice adequate for successful non-co-operation."

"That is, your survey of the conditions, you think, justifies your advising non-co-operation in the full conviction that you have behind you the support of the vast masses of the Mussalman population?"—"Yes."

“This non-co-operation, you are satisfied, will extend to complete severance of co-operation with the Government?”—“No; nor is it at the present moment my desire that it should. I am simply practising non-co-operation to the extent that is necessary to make the Government realise the depth of popular feeling in the matter and the dissatisfaction with the Government that all that could be done has not been done either by the Government of India or by the Imperial Government, whether on the Khilafat question or on the Punjab question.”

“Do you, Mr. Gandhi, realise that even amongst Mahomedans there are sections of people who are not enthusiastic over non-co-operation however much they may feel the wrong that has been done to their community?”—“Yes. But their number is smaller than those who are prepared to adopt non-co-operation.”

“And yet does not the fact that there has not been an adequate response to your appeal for resignation of titles and offices and for boycott of elections of the Councils, indicate that you may be placing more faith in their strength of conviction than is warranted?”—“I think not; for the reason that the stage has only just come into operation and our people are always most cautious and slow to move. Moreover, the first stage largely affects the uppermost strata of society, who represent a microscopic minority though they are undoubtedly an influential body of people.”

“This upper class, you think, has sufficiently responded to your appeal?”—“I am unable to say either one way or the other at present. I shall be able to give a definite answer at the end of this month.....”

“Do you think that without one’s loyalty to the King and the Royal Family being questioned, one can advocate non-co-operation in connection with the Royal visit?”—

“Most decidedly for the simple reason that if there is any disloyalty about the proposed boycott of the Prince’s visit, it is disloyalty to the Government of the day and not to the person of His Royal Highness.”

“What do you think is to be gained by promoting this boycott in connection with the Royal visit?”—“Because I want to show that the people of India are not in sympathy with the Government of the day and that they strongly disapprove of the policy of the Government in regard to the Punjab and Khilafat, and even in respect of other important administrative measures. (I consider that the visit of the Prince of Wales is a singularly good opportunity to the people to show their disapproval of the present Government.) After all, the visit is calculated to have tremendous political results. It is not to be a non-political event, and seeing that the Government of India and the Imperial Government want to make the visit a political event of first class importance, namely, for the purpose of strengthening their hold upon India, I for one consider that it is the bounden duty of the people to boycott the visit which is being engineered by the two Governments in their own interest which at the present moment is totally antagonistic to the people.”

“Do you mean that you want this boycott promoted because you feel that the strengthening of the hold upon India is not desirable in the best interests of the country?”—“Yes. The strengthening of the hold of a Government so wicked as the present one is not desirable for the best

interests of the people. Not that I want the bond between England and India to become loosened for the sake loosening it, but I want that bond to become strengthened only in so far as it adds to the welfare of India."

"Do you think non-co-operation and the non-boycott of the Legislative Councils consistent?"—"No; because a person who takes up the programme of non-co-operation cannot consistently stand for Councils."

"Is non-co-operation, in your opinion, an end in itself or a means to an end, and if so, what is the end?"—"It is a means to end, the end being to make the present Government just, whereas it has become mostly unjust. Co-operation with a just Government is a duty; non-co-operation with an unjust Government is equally a duty."

"Will you look with favour upon the proposal to enter the Councils and to carry on either obstructive tactics or to decline to take the oath of allegiance as consistent with your non-co-operation?"—"No; as an accurate student of non-co-operation, I consider that such a proposal is inconsistent with the true spirit of non-co-operation. I have often said that a Government really thrives on obstruction, and so far as the proposal not to take the oath of allegiance is concerned, I can really see no meaning in it; it amounts to a useless waste of valuable time and money."

"In other words, obstruction is no stage in non-co-operation?"—"No....."

"Are you satisfied that all efforts at constitutional agitation have been exhausted and that non-co-operation is the only course left us?"—"I do not consider non-co-operation to be unconstitutional, but I do believe that of all

the constitutional remedies now left open to us, non-co-operation is the only one left for us."

"Do you consider it constitutional to adopt it with a view merely to paralyse Government?"—"Certainly, it is not unconstitutional, but a prudent man will not take all the steps that are constitutional if they are otherwise undesirable, nor do I advise that course. I am resorting to non-co-operation in progressive stages because I want to evolve true order out of untrue order. I am not going to take a single step in non-co-operation unless I am satisfied that the country is ready for that step, namely, non-co-operation will not be followed by anarchy or disorder."

"How will you satisfy yourself that anarchy will not follow?"

"For instance, if I advise the police to lay down their arms, I shall have satisfied myself that we are able by voluntary assistance to protect ourselves against thieves and robbers. That was precisely what was done in Lahore and Amritsar last year by the citizens by means of volunteers when the military and the police had withdrawn. Even where Government had not taken such measures in a place, for want of adequate force, I know people have successfully protected themselves."

"You have advised lawyers to non-co-operate by suspending their practice. What is your experience? Has the lawyers' response to your appeal encouraged you to hope that you will be able to carry through all stages of non-co-operation with the help of such people?"

"I cannot say that a large number has yet responded to my appeal. It is too early to say how many will res-

pond. But I may say that I do not rely merely upon the lawyer class or highly educated men to enable the Committee to carry out all the stages of non-co-operation. My hope lies more with the masses so far as the later stages of non-co-operation are concerned."

THE MISTS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 20, 1921.)

Whenever I find my friends misunderstanding the movement, I mutter to myself the words of a celebrated hymn : "We shall know each other better when the mists have rolled away." A friend has just sent me the paragraphs on non-co-operation in the *Servant of India* of the 14th inst. It is such a fruitless task explaining resolutions and motives. The year will soon pass away, and our actions more than words will demonstrate the meaning of non-co-operation.

For me non-co-operation is not suspended, and never will be, so long as the Government has not purged itself of the crimes against India—the Mussalmans and the Punjabees, and so long as the system is not changed to respond to the will of the nation. Surely it was necessary to remove the hallucination about titles, law-courts, schools and councils. I venture to think that on the whole the nationalists have responded nobly in regard to these items. There are no titled men among them, no nationalist lawyer who has not suspended practice has any public status among non-co-operators, schools and colleges have

furnished boys and girls who are now giving a good account of themselves and who, I make bold to say, will, stagger humanity by their sacrifice when the time of their trial has arrived. Those who have refrained from entering the councils, are rendering, as all who care may see, a service which they could not have rendered in the council halls. The few who have given up their titles have shown the way to the others. All these are acting as leaven in the community. Now, there is little need for verbal propaganda among these special classes. The action and character of those who have renounced titles, schools, courts or councils, constitute a propaganda more telling and effective than speeches. National schools are multiplying themselves, boys are still leaving schools and colleges. The Government statistics are hopelessly wrong. I remember having seen a councillor quoting that less than 3000 students had left educational institutions. This takes no count of thousands who are studying in nationalised schools. The number of suspensions of practice is steadily growing. . . . Even titles are still being surrendered. And as the timid or the cautious realise that the movement is a serious and a religious effort, that it has taken permanent hold of the people, they too will renounce.

I should not be surprised if the history of the South African movement repeats itself in India. I should be surprised if it proves otherwise. The movement in South Africa started with a unanimous resolution. When the first part began, the majority weakened. Only 150 were found willing to court imprisonment. Then there was a settlement and a breach and a revival. Nobody even believed,

save a few of us, that the response would come in time. Well, the last stage commenced with sixteen men and women who sought imprisonment. This was followed by a perfect storm. The whole community rose like a surging wave. Without organisation, without propaganda, all—nearly 40,000—courted imprisonment. Nearly ten thousand were actually imprisoned. The sequel is known. The community gained all it had fought for at the time. A bloodless revolution was effected after strenuous discipline in self-suffering.

I refuse to believe that India will do less. To recall Lord Canning's words, under the blue and serene Indian sky a cloud no bigger than a man's thumb may appear on the horizon, but it may any moment assume dimensions unexpected by any, and no man can tell when it may burst. When India as a whole will respond by action, I cannot say. But this I do say that the educated classes to whom the Congress has appealed will one day—and probably during this year—respond in a manner worthy of the nation.

But whether they do or not, the progress of the nation cannot be arrested by any person or class. The uneducated artisans, the women, the men in the street, are taking their share in the movement. The appeal to the educated classes paved the way for them. The goats had to be sifted from the sheep. The educated classes had to be put upon their trial. The beginning had to be made by and through them. Non-co-operation has hitherto, thank God, followed its natural course.

Swadeshi propaganda in its intensive and exclusive form had to come and it has come in its order. It was, and is

part of the non-co-operation programme. It is, I claim, the biggest, the safest, and the surest part. It could not be taken up earlier in its present form. The country had to see its way clear to the spinning wheel. It had to be purged of the old superstitions and prejudices. The country had to appreciate the futility of the boycott of British goods merely, and equally of *all* foreign goods. It had to see that it lost its liberty by giving up Swadeshi in cloth and that it could regain it by reverting to hand-spun and hand-woven cloth. It had to see that it lost its artistic taste and talent, when it innocently ceased to spin and weave by the hand. It had to see that it was not even so much the military drain, as the loss of this supplementary industry that sapped India's vitality and made famines an ever-recurring event in Indian life. Men with faith in the spinning wheel had to rise in every province, and people had to appreciate the beauty and the use of *khaddar*.

All these things have now happened. The crore men and women and the crore rupees are required to resuscitate this National *dharma*. The problem is not that of a few *charkhas* but of putting *charkhas* in every one of the six crore homes. The problem is that of manufacturing and distributing the whole of the cloth required by India. It cannot be done by one crore rupees. But if India gives one crore rupees, one crore men and women introduce two million *charkhas* in working order in as many homes before the 30th June, she is nearly ready for Swaraj. Because the effort will have created, in the nation as a whole, all the qualities that make a nation good, great, self-reliant and self-contained.

When the nation has, by a voluntary effort, completed its boycott of foreign cloth, it will be ready for Swaraj. Then I promise that the various forts in the Indian cities will, instead of being an insolent menace to the freedom of India, become play-grounds for her children. Then the relations between Englishmen and ourselves will have been purified. Then the Lancashire vote will have been sterilised. And Englishmen will, if they choose, remain in India as friends and equals, with one sole aim—truly of benefitting and helping India. Non-co-operation is a movement intended to invite Englishmen to co-operate with us on honourable terms or retire from our land. It is a movement to place our relations on a pure basis, to define them in a manner consistent with our self-respect and dignity.

But call the movement by any other name. Call it 'swadeshi and temperance.' Assume that all these previous months have been a waste of effort. I invite the Government and the moderate friends to co-operate with the nation in making hand-spinning universal and in making drinking a crime. Neither party need speculate as to the result of these two movements. The tree will be judged by its fruit.

GANDHI OLD AND NEW

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 4, 1921.)

The *Times of India* has returned to the charge of insincerity which was to be inferred from its previous

article which I dealt with recently in these columns. It is a sober article to which no exception could be taken. I am certainly anxious to retain the reputation for sincerity which has been credited to me and which I certainly claim. My article, "The Mists" (Page 370) should generally be regarded as my last word to my critics. I must rely upon my actions for final explanation. No man can be called just, sincere, or good before his death. But I would like to correct some of the misstatements of the *Times of India* writer. Even when I declared Satyagraha, I was charged with having fallen from my original non-political state and the state of isolation. Even in South Africa, I was referred by my critics to my past. Every campaign that I have been connected with had its critics who praised my past at the expense of the then present. I state this fact not to disprove the present charge but to steel my heart against believing in the charge of unconscious insincerity and self-deception. I never suspended Satyagraha, I certainly never retired into private life. I suspended civil disobedience, and it remains still suspended, because I believed, as I still believe, the country not to be ripe for it. My Himalayan mistake was my miscalculation of the preparedness of the country. Non-co-operation of the type undertaken is not attended with any danger such as is attendant on civil disobedience. The latter is not *always* a duty as non-co-operation is. Hence it is that I have said that

✓ I must continue to advise non-co-operation even though it may result in anarchy. Am I to recall my medals, or advise friends to recall theirs, or advise lawyers to resume practice because, supposing, anar-

chists have gained the upper hand? Am I to associate myself for fear of anarchy with a dishonest government which believes in Dyerism as a faith? I know that anarchy as a creed is devilish, but Dyerism is still more so for it is anarchy wearing the mask of constituted authority. Ordered anarchy is infinitely worse than avowed anarchy. Only, in the latter event, I should dissociate myself from the anarchy of the mob as I have dissociated myself from the anarchy of the Government. For me both are evils to be shunned. I have not asked for reprisals against the author of the Jallianwala Massacre. I have asked for nothing more than the stopping of the pensions to the culprits and the dismissal of those who are yet holding office. I have not advised the Sikhs to give any pension to Mahant Narandas or to keep him in office. I have ventured to advise the Sikhs to waive the prosecution of the murderers as I have advised the nation to waive the prosecution of the official murderers in the Punjab. I claim consistency of conduct about Amritsar and Nankhana. I have said repeatedly that I am acting towards the Government as I have acted towards my own dearest relatives. Non-co-operation on the political field is an extension of the doctrine as it is practised on the domestic field. The reference to my association with lawyers, &c., is hardly becoming. As a matter of fact there are very few practising lawyers now holding office in Congress organizations.

I adhere to my opinion that where non-co-operators are in a majority, none who has not fully non-co-operated should hold office. The Congress Committee has not rejected the proposal. I do not know that practising

lawyers presented me with any address in Surat. But I would not hesitate to receive one even from them so long as I was free to wean them from the error of their ways. So far as my association with the Ali Brothers is concerned, I consider it a proud privilege. But in South Africa I had as my associates murderers and thieves, men who had certainly suffered imprisonment for attempts to murder or steal. Only they carried out their compact as to non-violence as honourably as any other Satyagrahi. I see no difference between the old Gandhi and the new, except that the new has a clearer conception of Satyagraha and prizes the doctrine of Ahimsa more than ever. Nor, I promise the *Times of India* writer, is there any self-deception in this belief. But time must show who is right. Precedent is on my side.

TO THE MODERATES

(June 8, 1921.)

Dear Friends,

It is a matter of no small grief to me, that I find myself estranged from you in ideas, although by training and association I have been brought up in the company of those who have been regarded as Moderates. Partly owing to circumstances, and partly owing to temperament, I have never belonged to any of the great parties in India. Nevertheless, my life has been influenced much more by men belonging to the Moderate party than the Extremist. Dadabhai Naoroji, Gokhale, Badruddin Tyabji, Pherozeshah Mehta are all names to conjure with. Their services

to the country can never be forgotten. They have inspired the lives of many like myself throughout our country. I have enjoyed the pleasantest associations with many of the living amongst you. What is it that has flung me away from you and into the lap of the Nationalist party? Why do I find more in common with the Nationalists than with you? I am unable to see that you love your country less than the Nationalists. I refuse to believe that you are less willing to sacrifice yourselves for the country's good, than the Nationalists. Certainly the Moderate party can claim as much intelligence, integrity and ability as the Nationalists, if not more. The difference, therefore, lies in the ideals.

I will not weary you with a discussion of the different ideals. For the moment, I will simply invite your attention to some of the items in the constructive programme in the movement of non-co-operation. You may not like the word itself. You may intensely dislike, as I know you do, many items in the programme. But if you concede to the non-co-operators the same credit for love of the land that you will claim for yourselves, will you not view with favour those parts of the programme on which there cannot be two opinions? I refer to the drink evil. I ask you to accept my evidence that the country as a whole is sick of the drink curse. Those unfortunate men, who have become slaves to the habit, require to be helped against themselves. Some of them even ask to be helped. I invite you to take advantage of the wave of feeling that has been roused against the drink traffic. The agitation arose spontaneously. Believe me, the deprivation to the

Government of the drink revenue is of the least importance in the campaign. The country is simply impatient of the evil itself. In no country in the world will it be possible to carry on this traffic in the face of the united and the enlightened opposition of a people, such as is now to be witnessed in India. Whatever the errors or excesses that were committed by the mob in Nagpur, the cause was just. The people were determined to do away with the drink curse that was sapping their vitality. You will not be deceived by the specious argument that India must not be made sober by compulsion, and that those who wish to drink must have facilities provided for them. The State does not cater for the vices of its people. We do not regulate or license houses of ill fame. We do not provide facilities for thieves to indulge their propensity for thieving. I hold drink to be more damnable than thieving and perhaps even prostitution. Is it not often the parent of both? I ask you to join the country in sweeping out of existence the drink revenue and abolishing the liquor shops. Many liquor sellers would gladly close their shops, if the money paid by them were refunded.

✓ 'What about the education of the children?' may be the question asked. I venture to suggest to you that it is a matter of deep humiliation for the country to find its children educated from the drink revenue. We shall deserve the curse of posterity if we do not wisely decide to stop the drink evil, even though we may have to sacrifice the education of our children. But we need not. I know, many of you have laughed at the idea of making education self-supporting by introducing spinning in our

schools and colleges. I assure you that it solves the problem of education as nothing else can. The country cannot bear fresh taxation. Even the existing taxation is unbearable. Not only must we do away with the opium and the drink revenue, but the other revenues have also to be very considerably reduced if the ever-growing poverty of the masses is to be combated in the near future.

And that brings me to the existing system of government. The country is the poorer for the Reforms. The annual expenditure has grown. A deeper study of the system has convinced me that no tinkering with it will do. A complete revolution is the greatest need of the time. The word revolution displeases you. What I plead for, however, is not a bloody revolution, but a revolution in the thought-world, such as would compel a radical revision of the standard of life in the higher services of the country. I must frankly confess to you, that the ever increasing rate of salaries paid to the higher branches of the Civil Service fairly frightens me, as I hope it would frighten you. Is there any correspondence between the life of the governors and of the governed millions who are groaning under their heels? The bruised bodies of the latter are a standing testimony to the truth of my statement. You now belong to the governing class. Let it not be said that your heels are no softer than your predecessors' or your associates'. Must you also rule from Simla? Must you also follow the policy that only a year ago you criticised adversely? It is under your *regime* that a man has been sentenced to transportation for life for holding certain opinions. You may not plead that he was inciting to violence, for not very long ago you

dismissed such pleas. The Ali Brothers have apologised for even a suspicion of violence in their speeches. You will be doing a cruel injustice to the country, if you allow yourselves to believe that any fear of prosecution has prompted the apology. A new spirit has been born in the country. The fear of the judge within is more terrible than that of the one without. Do you know that during the past six months several high-souled youths, your countrymen, have gone to gaol, because they will not condescend to give security, which in their opinion was dishonourable for them to do? It is under your *regime* that the patience of utterly innocent Moplas has been put to a severe test, and has as yet not been found wanting. I would gladly think, as I really believe, that you are not responsible for the atrocities that are at present being perpetrated in the name of peace and justice. But you will not let the public or me say that you are helpless where you are not hoodwinked. That, however, would bring me to a discussion of our ideals, which I must not enter upon at the present moment. If the country can only get your assistance in stopping the drink traffic, you will certainly add to the many services that you have rendered it in the past, and, may be, that one step will open your eyes to many another possibility.

I remain,
Yours as ever,
M. K. Gandhi. *

* In connection with this letter to the Moderates, Mr Gandhi wrote in the *Young India* of June 22, 1921.—A misunderstanding has arisen regarding my letter to the Moderates. I am amazed at the poverty of

DR. POLLEN ON THE WARPATH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 22, 1921.)

I have received Dr. John Pollen's open letter. I do not print it here, as it has already appeared in the Press. It is quite like him. He has hardly taken the trouble of studying the non-co-operation movement. Yet he has seen no harm in condemning what he does not know. He

expression I betray so often. I am not by any means an indifferent writer. I take great pains to be accurate and plain. And yet I have succeeded in leaving the impression in 'a critic' in the *Servant of India*, that I expect the Moderates to join the non-co-operators in picketing. I do nothing of the kind. Picketing might appear to the co-operators to be too clumsy and too incomplete to commend itself to them. But I thought, that they would help the temperance cause *in their own way*, i. e. by immediately abolishing the drink shops. It is the least they owe to the country. Daily, as the heat of the picketing is increasing, the pickets come in for the attentions of the keepers of liquor shops and of their customers. I understand that two pickets were struck by some ruffians and had their heads broken in Ahmedabad. These brave men now daily appear at their post with bandaged heads. A volunteer was slapped in the presence of a crowd in Bombay, and he stood his ground firmly but did not retaliate. Such instances must multiply, as the effect of picketing is felt by the sellers of spirituous liquors. It is impossible to stop this reform, even though pickets lose their lives in the performance of their duty. The work must continue, so long as there are enough young men and women found ready to take up picketing, and so long as they are ready to risk their lives without retaliating. It was because I was aware of the danger, that I appealed to the patriotism of the Moderates with a view to abolishing at a stroke all drink-shops, and thus saving young men and young women from injury to limb or life. It grieves me, therefore, to find that I failed in my letter to carry the point home. I am aware that at some future date temperance reform will come. It is small comfort to a man whose house is on fire, that appliances are in course of preparation to deal with such fires.

asks me to rely upon his own *ipse-dixit* in preference to my own experience. The pity of it is, that Dr. Pollen's letter represents the average English attitude—laziness to study the other side, and arrogation of omniscience and consequent self-satisfaction. With a people so constituted, either non-co-operation or violence is the only thing that answers. If you murder, they are shocked into action; if you cease to speak to them, they are moved to inquire. The shock produced by murder provokes action, but rarely enlightenment. It creates bad blood, not excluding terrorism. The relief is partial and often proves more dangerous than the disease itself. Whereas the refusal to speak, to participate in the evil, to assist one's own degradation, to co-operate with the wrong-doer, gives strength to oneself, and awakens and purifies the wrong-doer. India, I hope, has chosen the better way for all time. Dr. Pollen is too lazy to see that non-co-operation being an insurance against violence, necessarily involves the possibility of violence. It is an attempt to supplant violence. The least that non-co-operation has done is to postpone violence, and if it is tried long enough, it will give such strength to the people as would enable them to see that violence is totally unnecessary. Non-co-operation is a septic treatment. It heals without killing.

Dr. Pollen should have known, that I remain just as opposed to boycott of *British goods* as ever. I have always advocated, as I advocate to-day, boycott of *all foreign cloth for all time*, and boycott of such other foreign goods as India can profitably manufacture. The swadeshi that I have conceived excludes the idea of punishment or revenge. It means self-help and recognition of the natural

law that the best service to humanity is to help that part of it, which is nearest to you. An India self-dependent will help the whole world, an India helpless and clothed by Manchester and Japan harms both herself and the latter.

Let me further inform Dr. Pollen, that whilst I am a determined enemy of the system of government to which in my ignorance I was once friendly, I still count myself a friend of the British people. My religion forbids me to have friends and foes. I therefore assure him that I shall for ever be actuated by the same feelings towards the British people as towards brothers and am now acting towards them, as I have acted towards my blood-brothers.

I must adhere to the adjectives I have felt it my duty to use regarding the system, and my business is, whilst calling an evil thing evil, to restrain an outburst of evil passions against wrong-doers. It would be foolish to ignore or hide a disease for fear of the patient running amok in panic. He must be warned of the disease, and provided with a tolerably safe remedy.

Dr. Pollen's ignorant preface is followed by an unsupported denial of all the propositions that I believe in, in common with the rest of India, *viz.*,

✓ (1) The Indian administration is the most expensive in the world.

(2) India is poorer to-day than it ever has been.

(3) The drink evil has been never so bad as it is to-day. (Nobody has contended that there was no drink evil in India before the advent of the British).

(4) India is held in the last resort by a system of terrorism.)

Not only does Dr. Pollen deny these truths known to us all, but he asserts that the administration is cheaper than elsewhere, and forgets that the Indian Civil Service is the most highly paid service in the world, and that more than a third of the revenue is absorbed by the military service. Imagine the state of a family which has to devote a third of its income for paying its doorkeepers!

Dr. Pollen asserts that India is 'really a marvellously rich country inhabited for the most part by a comparatively poor and reckless peasantry.' He then asks me to multiply the average annual income of Rs. 27 by five, and argues that Rs. 135 a year for a family of five will suffice for its support. I suggest to him that Rs. 2-4-0 per head per month will not feed, clothe and house the poorest among the poor, and that I should still further reduce the average for the masses of poor men, because it is reached by including the millions of millionaires. The average income of the poor, therefore, is an incontestable proof not only of the poverty, but of the semi-starvation of India.

Dr. Pollen has the effrontery to suggest, in the face of an ever-growing drink revenue, that the present administration discourages excessive drinking.

Lastly, Dr. Pollen not only denies the existence of terrorism, but contends that 'in all respects in India, they (we) are as free as the Scots, the Welsh, the people of the Dominions, and as the English themselves.'

Only non-co-operation will dispel such hopeless ignorance.

TO EVERY ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA—II

(July 13, 1921.)

Dear Friend,

This is the second time I venture to address you. I know that most of you detest non-co-operation. But I would invite you to isolate two of my activities from the rest, if you can give me credit for honesty.

I cannot prove my honesty, if you do not feel it. Some of my Indian friends charge me with camouflage when I say we need not hate Englishmen whilst we may hate the system they have established. I am trying to show them that one may detest the wickedness of a brother without hating him. (Jesus denounced the wickedness of the Scribes and the Pharisees, but he did not hate them. He did not enunciate this law of love for the man and hate for the evil in him for himself only, but he taught the doctrine for universal practice.) Indeed, I find it in all the Scriptures of the world.

I claim to be a fairly accurate student of human nature and vivisector of my own failings. I have discovered that man is superior to the system he propounds. And so I feel that you as an individual are infinitely better than the system you have evolved as a corporation. Each one of my countrymen in Amritsar on that fateful 10th of April was better than the crowd of which he was a member. He, as a man, would have declined to kill those innocent English bank managers. But in that crowd, many a man forgot himself. Hence it is that an Englishman in office is different from an Englishman outside. Similarly an Englishman in India is different from an Englishman in England. Here, in India, you belong to a system that

is vile beyond description. It is possible, therefore, for me to condemn the system in the strongest terms, without considering you to be bad and without imputing bad motives to every Englishman. You are as much slaves of the system as we are.' I want you, therefore, to reciprocate and not impute to me motives which you cannot read in the written word. I give you the whole of my motive when I tell you that I am impatient to end or mend a system which has made India subservient to a handful of you and which has made Englishmen feel secure only in the shadow of the forts and the guns that obtrude themselves on one's notice in India. It is a degrading spectacle for you and for us. Our corporate life is based on mutual distrust and fear. This, you will admit, is unmanly. A system that is responsible for such a state of things is necessarily satanic. You should be able to live in India as an integral part of its people and not always as foreign exploiters. One thousand Indian lives against one English life is a doctrine of dark despair, and yet, believe me, it was enunciated in 1919 by the highest of you in the land.

✓I almost feel tempted to invite you to join me in destroying a system that has dragged both you and us down. But I feel I cannot as yet do so. We have not shown ourselves earnest, self-sacrificing and self-restrained enough for that consummation.

But I do ask you to help us in the boycott of foreign cloth and in the anti-drink campaign.

The Lancashire cloth, as English historians have shown, was forced upon India, and her own world-famed manufactures were deliberately and systematically ruined.

India is, therefore, at the mercy not only of Lancashire but also of Japan, France and America. Just see what this has meant to India. We send out of India every year sixty crores (more or less) of rupees for cloth. We grow enough cotton for our own cloth. Is it not madness to send cotton outside India, and have it manufactured into cloth there and shipped to us ? Was it right to reduce India to such a helpless state ?

A hundred and fifty years ago, we manufactured all our cloth. Our women spun fine yarn in their own cottages and supplemented the earnings of their husbands. The village weavers wove that yarn. It was an indispensable part of national economy in a vast agricultural country like ours. It enabled us in a most natural manner to utilise our leisure. To-day our women have lost the cunning of their hands, and the enforced idleness of millions has impoverished the land. Many weavers have become sweepers. Some have taken to the profession of hired soldiers. Half the race of artistic weavers had died out, and the other half is weaving imported foreign yarn for want of finer hand-spun yarn.

You will perhaps now understand what boycott of foreign cloth means to India. It is not devised as a punishment. If the Government were to-day to redress the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and consent to India attaining immediate Swaraj, the boycott movement must still continue. Swaraj means at least the power to conserve Indian industries that are vital to the economic existence of the nation, and to prohibit such imports as may interfere with such existence. (Agriculture and hand-spinning are the two lungs of the national body. They must be protected against consumption at any cost.)

This matter does not admit of any waiting. The interests of the foreign manufacturers and the Indian importers cannot be considered when the whole nation is starving for want of a large productive occupation ancillary to agriculture.

You will not mistake this for a movement of general boycott of foreign goods. India does not wish to shut herself out of international commerce. Things other than cloth which can be better made outside India, she must gratefully receive upon terms advantageous to the contracting parties. Nothing can be forced upon her. But I do not wish to peep into the future. I am certainly hoping, that before long it would be possible for India to co-operate with England on equal terms. Then will be the time for examining trade relations. For the time being, I bespeak your help in bringing about a boycott of foreign cloth.

Of similar and equal importance is the campaign against drink. The liquor shops are an insufferable curse imposed upon society. There never was so much awakening among the people as now upon this question. I admit that here it is the Indian ministers who can help more than you can. But I would like you to speak out your mind clearly on the question. Under every system of government, total prohibition, so far as I can see, will be insisted upon by the nation. You can assist the growth of the ever-rising agitation by throwing in the weight of your influence on the side of the nation.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. GANDHI.

PART V

N. C. O. Programme

HOW AND WHEN TO ACT

DETAILS OF THE FIRST STAGE

(July 7, 1920.)

The following is a statement issued by the Non-co-operation Committee for public information and guidance :—

Many questions have been asked of the Non-co-operation Committee as to its expectation and the methods to be adopted for beginning non-co-operation.

The committee wish it to be understood that whilst they expect every one to respond to their recommendations to the full, they are desirous of carrying the weakest members also with them. The Committee want to enlist the passive sympathy, if not the active co-operation, of the whole of the country in the method of non-co-operation.

Those, therefore, who cannot undergo physical sacrifice will help by contributing funds or labour to the movement.

Should non-co-operation become necessary, the Committee has decided upon the following as part of the first stage :—

(1) Surrender of all titles of honour and honorary offices.

(2) Non-participation in Government loans.

(3) Suspension by lawyers of practice and settlement of civil disputes by private arbitration.

(4) Boycott of Government schools by parents.

(5) Boycott of the Reformed Councils.

(6) Non-participation in Government parties and such other functions.

(7) Refusal to accept any civil or military post in Mesopotamia, or to offer as units for the army especially for service in the Turkish territories now being administered in violation of pledges.

(8) Vigorous prosecution of "Swadeshi" inducing the people, at the time of this national and religious awakening, to appreciate their primary duty to their country by being satisfied with its own productions and manufactures.

Swadeshi must be pushed forward without waiting for the 1st of August, for it is an eternal rule of conduct not to be interrupted even when the settlement arrives.

In order not to commit themselves, people will refrain now from taking service, civil or military. They will also suspend taking Government loans, new or old.

For the rest, it should be remembered that non-co-operation does not commence before 1st August next.

Every effort is being, and will still be, made to avoid resort to such a serious breach with the Government by urging His Majesty's Ministers to secure the revision of a Treaty which has been so universally condemned.

Those who realise their responsibility and gravity of the cause will not act independently, but in concert with the Committee. Success depends entirely upon disciplined and concerted non-co-operation and the latter is depen-

dent upon strict obedience to instructions, calmness and absolute freedom from violence.

i. Boycott of Reformed Councils

THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 31, 1919.)

The Proclamation issued by the Sovereign on the 24th inst. is a document of which the British people have every reason to be proud, and with which every Indian ought to feel satisfied. Coming on the top of the disclosures made before Lord Hunter's Committee, the Proclamation gives one an insight into the true British character. For as the Proclamation shows it at its best, General Dyer's inhumanity shows it at its worst. The Proclamation is the evidence of the intention to do justice, as General Dyer's deed is proof of man becoming devil under fear and excitement. I believe that the juxtaposition of the two events is a pure accident. The Proclamation was the inevitable consequence of the great measure which has received Royal assent. It was the finishing touch. The Reforms Act coupled with the Proclamation is an earnest of the intention of the British people to do justice to India. And it ought to remove suspicion on that score. But that does not mean that we may sit with folded hands and may still expect to get what we want. Under the British constitution no one gets anything without a hard fight for it. No one for a

moment believes the statements made in the Parliament that the Reforms have not been granted because of the agitation. We must lay to heart the advice of the President of the Congress that we shall gain nothing without agitation. We would have been nowhere if there had been no Congress to agitate for the rights of the people. Agitation means no more than movement towards something. But just as all movement does not mean progress, so does all agitation not mean success. Undisciplined agitation which is a paraphrase of violence of speech or deed can only retard national growth and bring about even unmerited retribution such as the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre. Disciplined agitation is the condition of national growth. The most correct agitation, therefore, consists in the most correct action and we have little doubt that the Royal Proclamation and the Reforms mean not less agitation and less work but more agitation and more work of the correct type.

The Reforms are undoubtedly incomplete ; they do not give us enough ; we were entitled to more, we could have managed more. But the Reforms are not such as we may reject. On the contrary they are such as to enable us to expand. Our duty therefore is not to subject them to carping criticism but to settle down quietly to work so as to make them a thorough success and thus anticipate the time for a full measure of responsibility.* Our work

* In the course of an article in the issue of Jan. 7, 1920, Mr. Gandhi thus wrote about the Reforms :—Whilst I subscribe entirely to the proposition that India is fit now for responsible government, I do not for one moment believe that we can get it without working for it. We can work either by adopting obstructive tactics or by co-operation. Healthy obstruction is a condition of our being. We must ever obstruct untruth, injustice

therefore may now well consist in agitation turned inward. Let us concentrate on ridding ourselves of social abuses, on producing a strong electorate and on sending to the councils men who would seek election not for self-advertisement but for national service.

There has been much mutual distrust between us—the English and ourselves. General Dyer forgot the dignity of man and became unmanly because he was seized with

and evil. It was because I did not consider, and do not consider, the Reforms to be an evil or unjust and because I consider them to be a progressive step towards responsible government, that I decline to consider them to be disappointing, however inadequate and unsatisfactory they may be. I endorse Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's opinion that for me to decline to consider the Reforms disappointing means that I did not expect them. I had certainly much fear that the Reforms might not go through when they did and I was unprepared for material improvements in the measure as it was originally published. The opponents of the amendment admitted that they would co-operate when co-operation was essential for the country's good and not hesitate to obstruct when obstruction advanced it. That no doubt was the only meaning, and no other, of the amendment of which I had the honour to be in charge. But let it be said to the credit of the opponents that they resisted the amendment as long as they could because they frankly said that they had faith in the bureaucracy even under the altered conditions. In my humble opinion it is a wrong attitude. The Royal Proclamation has been framed in a most liberal spirit. It is full of good-will and it would have been wrong on the part of the Congress not to have responded to the King's call for co-operation. My faith in human nature is irrepressible and even under the circumstances of a most adverse character I have found Englishmen amenable to reason and persuasion, and as they always wish to appear to be just even when they are in reality unjust, it is easier to shame them than others into doing the right thing. Be that however as it may, it would be a fall from our culture and it would be unwise not to grasp the hand of fellowship extended through the Proclamation. If we are strong we shall lose nothing by beginning with co-operation. We at once place the bureaucracy in the wrong by our readiness to co-operation for the common purpose.

distrust and consequent fear. He feared that he might be 'assaulted.' The Proclamation more than the Reforms replaces distrust by trust. It remains to be seen whether the trust will filter down to the civil service. But let us assume that it will, and let us respond in the fullest measure. We cannot be wrong in so doing. To trust is a virtue. It is weakness that begets distrust. The best satisfaction we can show is undoubtedly to work gracefully and ungrudgingly. Our honest work will constitute the best guarantee for quickening the pace of progress towards the goal.

Throughout all these years, the one figure that has laboured for India without, for a single moment, turning back is Mr. Montagu. We have had many Secretaries of State who have adorned their office. But no Secretary has so well adorned it as Mr. Montagu. He has been a true friend of India. He has earned our gratitude. And, for Lord Sinha? He has added lustre to his country. India has every reason to be proud of him.

"A HUMBLE SUGGESTION"

(May 19, 1920.)

Under the above heading Mr. Gandhi has contributed to the columns of *Navajivan* an article whose free rendering we give below. Mr. Gandhi says:—

I observe that many candidates have come forward for the choice of the would-be electors for the reformed councils. It must be granted that it is possible to render some service to the state by entering these councils. But

it is my firm belief that many can serve the country better by remaining outside. The late Mr. Keir Hardie used to say that it was practically impossible for a true Christian to remain in the British Parliament. Carlyle called it the talking shop. When there are many candidates, those who have accepted service of the land as an article of faith would do well to stand outside the lists, and they will find that they will be better occupied by educating the electorate and keeping the elected members to their promises at the polls. Even in England one sees the most effective service rendered by those who keep themselves outside the House of Commons. The real affairs of the English nation are conducted not by the seven hundred odd M. P's but by the larger body who really control them. I would therefore venture to suggest to the larger body of those whose only ambition is to serve India, not to trouble about entering the councils. To the aspirants after membership of councils I would respectfully urge: "Pray avoid the councils if it is any axe of your own which you want to grind there, for it can be ground elsewhere. In a chamber where only national interests are supposed to be conserved and where a stiff fight has to be put up against strong vested interests, how can you think of serving your own little interest? Surely you will not wish to injure the national cause by mixing your own with it." I do not know who are the aspirants. But I draw my inference from what happens over municipal council elections. We shall benefit by our people entering the councils if they are true men filled with humility and love of the country, courageous, fearless and versed in the subjects they have to handle.

The Reforms Act is full of defects which must be remedied. But even as a razor with the keenest edge is useless in incompetent hands, so may a most perfect constitution be rendered nugatory if it is handled by selfish or ignorant councillors. The most expeditious manner of reforming the Reforms Act would be to send to the councils only those who wish to serve the nation. In their hands, even a defective constitution may be utilised for the good of the nation, even as an able artizan effectively manages indifferent tools and even makes them better.

WHAT SHOULD THE VOTERS DO?

(June 9, 1920.)

Mr. Gandhi has devoted his second article on the forthcoming elections to the choice of the voters to the columns of *Navajivan*. We give below the substance:—

Many who had hitherto no concern with council elections will be shortly called upon to vote for the reformed councils. The powers too of elected members will be found to have increased. This adds to the voters' responsibility. In all our cities the citizens have been exercising the municipal franchise. And of these elections it cannot be said that the electors have always acquitted themselves in a wise manner. Electors' private relations with the candidates have often weighed with them more than the candidates' qualifications. It would be well if we set up a better standard for the elections to the legislative councils. Only thus shall we be able to make the

best use of the councils. I suggest also that voters should not identify themselves with any party or its quarrels. They should consider candidates' views and not their party. Their character should weigh more even than their views. A man of character will make himself worthy of any position he is given. Even his mistakes will not much matter. I consider it impossible for a man without character to do higher national service so that, if I were a voter from among the list, I would first select men of character and then I would understand their views. My questions to them would be :—

(1) Do you approve of the present Swadeshi movement? If so, are you prepared to levy heavy import duties on foreign cloth? Will you favour legislation for cheapening the materials and machinery required to produce Swadeshi articles?

(2) Do you hold that all the affairs of a province should be conducted in its own vernacular and that the affairs of the nation should be conducted in Hindustani—a combination of Hindi and Urdu? If you do, will you endeavour incessantly to introduce the use of the vernaculars in administration of the respective provinces, and the national language in the Imperial administration?

(3) Do you hold that present division of the provinces of India was made for administrative and political purposes and that no regard was paid to the people's wishes? And do you hold that this division has done much harm to the national growth? If you think so, will you try to bring out a redistribution on a linguistic basis as early as possible?

4. Do you hold that there is not the remotest likeli-

hood of India's regeneration without Hindu-Moslem unity? And if you think so, are you, if a Hindu, willing to help the Mussalmans in all legitimate ways in their trouble?

A satisfactory answer to them alone will entitle the candidates to my vote if I had one. I suggest these questions because I regard them as of great importance. If the electors do not see any significance in these questions, they may put others which they consider to be of greater importance for the upliftment of the nation. It is not the particular questions that matter but the knowing of candidates' views on national questions. My attempt is to point out that we need an electorate which is impartial, independent and intelligent. If the electors do not interest themselves in national affairs and remain unconcerned with what goes on in their midst, and if they elect men with whom they have private relations or whose aid they need for themselves, this state of things can do no good to the country; it will be harmful.

Now it remains to be considered what the electors should do if they do not receive satisfactory answer to their questions or if they cannot find men of character. It is an established custom with regard to elections that electors, if they do not find any candidate to their liking, need not register their votes. In such a case abstention amounts to an exercise of one's votes. Exception was taken to this procedure, that if good electors refuse to make their choice, bad electors would make the worst choice. This is to a certain extent true. But suppose in a certain place all candidates being drunkards the better portion of the electorate abstain from voting and the candidates

manage to secure votes from their kind, can they exercise any influence in the councils? No doubt their vote has its numerical value, but their views and speeches cannot influence the council. Moreover an intelligent abstention has its own effect. The electors having once failed to find a proper candidate will next time take steps to find out a suitable man and elect him, and by so doing they will raise the level of their own place. In a growing nation people are able to understand the national affairs and they are expected to purify the political atmosphere they live in and to maintain its purity. All enlightened and thoughtful voters will find that occasionally situation must arise when they will have to purposely refuse to register their votes. I earnestly hope that on such occasions our electors will have courage to do so. I hope that when they do exercise the vote they will give it to the best man no matter to which party he belongs.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE COUNCILS

MR. GANDHI'S STATEMENT

(July 7, 1920.)

Mr. Gandhi writes to the press :—

“Needless to say that I am in entire accord with Lala Lajpat Rai* on the question of the boycott of the reformed councils. For me it is but one step in the campaign of non-co-operation and as I feel equally keenly on the Punjab question as on the Khilafat, Lala Lajpat Rai's

* Mr. Lajpat Rai, in an article in *Bande Mataram*, condemned council entry.

suggestion is doubly welcome. I have seen the suggestion made in more quarters than one that non-co-operation on the reforms should commence after the process of election has been through. I cannot help saying that it is a mistake to go through the election farce and the expenses of it when we clearly do not intend to take part in the proceedings of these Legislative Councils.* Moreover, a great deal of educative work has to be done among the people. And if I could, I would not have the best attention of the country frittered away in electioneering. The populace will not understand the beauty of non-co-operation if we seek election and then resign. But it would be a fine education for them if the electors are not to elect

* Consistently with this opinion Mr. Gandhi wrote on the duty of electors in the *Navajivan* as follows:—(*Young India*, November 10, 1920).

The 16th of November is somewhat of a day of trial for the people, because on that day members for the Legislative Councils will be elected throughout the Bombay Presidency. What will the voters do on that day? What is their duty?

- (1) I hope that no voter will go to the polling booth to record his vote.
- (2) That all the voters will remain indoors.
- (3) In case a meeting is held away from the polling booth, voters will attend it and express themselves against being represented on the council.
- (4) The work of canvassing signatures and of asking voters not to vote will cease for 24 hours from the night of the 15th instant.
- (5) Volunteers too will not do anything on the 16th instant to dissuade voters from voting.
- (6) In short, those who choose to vote should have the day wholly at their disposal.

How can we hope to convert voters whom we have not been able to persuade till the 15th? Surely, we do not want to prevent anybody from voting by physical force. There can therefore be no persuasion on the 16th.

Our campaign is one of educating public opinion. When we have succeeded in doing that, then, and only then is Swaraj within easy reach.

anybody and unanimously to tell whosoever may seek their suffrage that he would not represent them if he so sought election so long as the Punjab and Khilafat questions were not satisfactorily settled. I hope, however, that Lala Lajpat Rai does not mean to end with the boycott of the reformed councils. We must take if necessary every one of the four stages of non-co-operation if we are to be regarded as a self-respecting nation. The issue is clear. Both the Khilafat terms and the Punjab affairs show that Indian opinion counts for little in the councils of the empire. It is a humiliating position, we shall make nothing of the reforms if we quietly swallow the humiliation. In my humble opinion therefore the first condition of real progress is the removal of these difficulties in our path. And unless some better course of action is devised *volens volens* non-co-operation must hold the field.

COUNCILS' BOYCOTT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 14, 1920.)

Pundit Rambhuj Dutt Chaudhry has ranged himself against Lala Lajpat Rai in the matter of the proposed boycott of the councils. Madras is divided, most of the nationalist leaders seem disinclined to boycott the councils. The *Mahratta* has pronounced against it in a well-reasoned article. The reasons for disapproval of boycott are mainly two. (1) If the nationalists refrain the moderates will get all the seats. (2) Since through the legislative councils we have made some progress, we are likely to

make greater progress by reason of larger powers having been granted to popular representatives.

Now the first reason hardly does credit to a great popular party. If it is harmful to enter the councils, why should nationalists be jealous of the moderates entering the councils! Must they participate in the harm because moderates will not refrain? Or, is it contended that the harm can be avoided only if all join the boycott? If the last is the contention it betrays ignorance of the principles of boycott. We boycott an institution because we do not like it or because we do not wish to co-operate with its conductors. In the matter of the councils the latter is the deciding reason. And I submit that in a sense we co-operate by joining even though the object is obstruction. Most institutions, and a British legislative council most of all, thrive upon obstruction. The disciplined obstruction of the Irish members made practically no impression upon the House of Commons. The Irishmen have not got the Home Rule they wanted. The *Mahratta* argues that obstruction would be active and aggressive non-co-operation. I venture to deny it. In my opinion it shows want of faith in yourself *i. e.* in your doctrine. You doubt and you perish. I do not believe that either the English or the moderate leaders can possibly contemplate with equanimity a nationalist boycott of the councils. We are now face to face with the reality. Will a single moderate leader care to enter any council if more than half his electorate disapproved of his offering himself as a candidate at all? I hold that it would be unconstitutional for him to

do so, because he will not represent his constituency. Boycott contemplated by me presupposes a most active discipline and watchful propaganda and it is based on the assumption that the electors themselves will prefer complete to an incomplete boycott in the form of obstruction. If it is assumed that the people themselves do not want a complete boycott, it would be the duty of those who believe in it to educate the electorates to appreciate the superiority of boycott over obstruction. To enter the councils is to submit to the vote of the majority *i. e.*, to co-operate. If then we want to stop the machinery of Government, as we want to, until we get justice in the Khilafat and the Punjab matters, we must put our whole weight against the Government and refuse to accept the vote of the majority in the council, because it will neither represent the wish of the country nor our own which is more to the point on a matter of principle. A minister who refuses to serve is better than one who serves under protest. Service under protest shows that the situation is not intolerable. I contend that the situation created by the Government has become intolerable and therefore the only course left open to a self-respecting person is non-cooperation *i. e.*, complete abstention. General Botha refused to enter Lord Milner's council, because he utterly disapproved of the principle that governed Lord Milner in dealing with the Boers. And General Botha succeeded because he had practically the whole of the Transvaal behind him. Politically considered, success depends upon the country accepting the boycott movement. Religiously considered success is there for the individual as soon as

he has *acted* upon the principle he holds and his action has ensured national success because he has laid the foundation by showing the straightest way to it.

The other argument is that we shall succeed by entering the new councils because we have after all not done quite so badly in having entered less popular bodies before. The answer to the objection is that the dividing line had not then been reached; we had not lost confidence in British honesty and justice or we had not confidence in ourselves then to carry boycott to the successful end or we had not thought of the method in the way we are doing to-day. Probably all the three reasons operate to-day. After all, manners and methods change with the times. We must grow with our years. What was good enough food for our babyhood cannot be good enough for manhood.

COUNCIL ELECTIONS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*November 24, 1920.*)

The elections in the Bombay Presidency and elsewhere have demonstrated the success of non-co-operation about councils in so far as the voters are concerned. In some cases not a single voter seems to have registered his vote. What will the so-called representatives do? They know that the voters have refrained from going to the polls, not out of laziness, but out of deliberation. They know too that thousands of voters have declared in writing their intention not to be represented. The members had ample opportunity of acting on the electors

and convincing them of the desirability of voting. They cannot complain of the intimidation or even picketing. For, the instructions were not to picket, and as far as I am aware, the instructions were implicitly followed. In the face of these facts, is it not the clear duty of the members declared to have been elected, not to have anything to do with the council? The electors have shown in no uncertain terms that they do not want to have anything to do with the reformed councils. The members will reduce representative institutions to an absurdity, if they persist in going to the council when they have the clearest possible mandate to the contrary.

If the so-called representatives do not obey the mandate of their electors, the course of the latter is quite clear. They must form voters' associations, and through these bodies pass votes of no confidence; they must address their respective members notifying their disapproval of their conduct in allowing themselves to be declared elected. It follows too that the electors must not on any account whatsoever take any work from these members. For them the council does not exist. They must not seek any relief through it. The next trial of the voters will commence when the council is opened, if at all, in the face of this verdict. The temptation to air grievances by having questions put in the council will be very great. The electors will have to resist the temptation.

But let us hope for the good of our country that the members themselves will bow to the verdict so emphatically declared by the electors.

ii. Boycott of Law Courts

DUTY OF LAWYERS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*August 11, 1920.*)

The Non-co-operation Committee has included, in the first stage, boycott of law-courts by lawyers and of Government schools and colleges by parents or scholars as the case may be. I know that it is only my reputation as a worker and fighter, which has saved me from an open charge of lunacy for having given the advice about boycott of courts and schools.

I venture however to claim some method about my madness. It does not require much reflection to see that it is through courts that a government establishes its authority and it is through schools that it manufactures clerks and other employees. They are both healthy institutions when the government in charge of them is on the whole just. They are death-traps when the government is unjust.

First as to lawyers. No newspaper has combated my views on non-co-operation with so much pertinacity and ability as the Allahabad *Leader*. It has ridiculed my views on lawyers expressed in my booklet, 'Indian Home Rule', written by me in 1908. I adhere to the views then expressed. And if I find time I hope to elaborate them in these columns. But I refrain from so doing for the time being, as my special views have nothing to do with my

advice on the necessity of lawyers suspending practice. I submit that national non-co-operation requires suspension of their practice by lawyers. Perhaps no one co-operates with a government more than lawyers through its law courts. Lawyers interpret laws to the people and thus support authority. It is for that reason that they are styled officers of the court. They may be called honorary office-holders. It is said that it is the lawyers who have put up the most stubborn fight against the Government. This is no doubt partly true. But that does not undo the mischief that is inherent in the profession. So when the nation wishes to paralyse the Government, that profession, if it wishes to help the nation to bend the Government to its will, must suspend practice. But, say the critics, the Government will be too pleased, if the pleaders and barristers fell into the trap laid by me. I do not believe it. What is true in ordinary times is not true in extraordinary times. In normal times the Government may resent fierce criticism of their manners and methods by lawyers, but in the face of fierce action they would be loath to part with a single lawyer's support through his practice in the courts.

Moreover, in my scheme, suspension does not mean stagnation. The lawyers are not to suspend practice and enjoy rest. They will be expected to induce their clients to boycott courts. They will improvise arbitration-boards in order to settle disputes. A nation, that is bent on forcing justice from an unwilling government, has little time for engaging in mutual quarrels. This truth the lawyers will be expected to bring home to their clients. The readers may not know that many of the most noted

lawyers of England suspended their work during the late war. The lawyers, then, upon temporarily leaving their profession, became whole-time workers instead of being workers only during their recreation hours. Real politics are not a game. The late Mr. Gokhale used to deplore that we had not gone beyond treating politics as a pastime. We have no notion as to how much the country has lost by reason of amateurs having managed its battles with the serious-minded, trained and whole-time working bureaucracy.

The critics then argue that the lawyers will starve if they leave their profession. This cannot be said of the Sinhas of the profession. They do at times suspend work for visiting Europe or otherwise. Of those who live from hand to mouth, if they are honest men, each local Khilafat Committee can pay them an honorarium against full time service.

Lastly, for Mahomedan lawyers, it has been suggested that if they stop their practice, Hindus will take it up. I am hoping Hindus will at least show the negative courage of not touching their Muslim brethren's clients, even if they do not suspend their own practice. But I am sure no religiously minded Mussalman will be found to say that they can carry on the fight only if the Hindus stand side by side with them in sacrifice. If the Hindus do as they must, it will be to their honour and for the common good of both. But the Mussalmans must go forward whether the Hindus join them or not. If it is a matter of life and death with them, they must not count the cost. No cost is too heavy for the preservation of one's honour, especially religious honour.

Only they will sacrifice who cannot abstain. Forced sacrifice is no sacrifice. It will not last. A movement lacks sincerity when it is supported by unwilling workers under pressure. The Khilafat movement will become an irresistible force when every Mussalman treats the peace terms as an individual wrong. No man waits for other's help or sacrifice in matters of private personal wrong. He seeks help no doubt, but his battle against the wrong goes on whether he gains help or not. If he has justice on his side, the Divine Law is that he does get help. God is the help of the helpless. When the Pandava brothers were unable to help Draupadi, God came to the rescue and saved her honour. The Prophet was helped by God when he seemed to be forsaken by men.

THE HALLUCINATION OF LAW COURTS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 6, 1920.)

If we were not under the spell of lawyers and law-courts and if there were no courts to tempt us into the quagmire of the courts and to appeal to our basest passions, we would be leading a much happier life than we do to-day. Let those who frequent the law-courts—the best of them—bear witness to the fact that the atmosphere about them is foetid. Perjured witnesses are ranged on either side, ready to sell their very souls for money or for friendship's sake. But that is not the worst of these courts. The worst is that they support the authority of a government. They are supposed to dispense justice and are

therefore called the palladile of a nation's liberty. But when they support the authority of an unrighteous Government they are no longer palladile of liberty, they are crushing houses to crush a nation's spirit. Such were the martial law tribunals and the summary courts in the Punjab. We had them in their nakedness. Such they are even in normal times when it is a matter of dispensing justice between a superior race and its helots. This is so all the world over. Look at the trial of an English officer and the farcical punishment he received for having deliberately tortured inoffensive negroes at Nairobi. Has a single Englishman suffered the extreme penalty of the law or anything like it for brutal murders in India? Let no one suppose that these things would be changed when Indian judges and Indian prosecutors take the place of Englishmen. Englishmen are not by nature corrupt. Indians are not necessarily angels. Both succumb to their environment. There were Indian judges and Indian prosecutors during the martial law regime, who were generally guilty of just as bad practices as the Englishmen. Those who tortured the innocent women in Amritsar were Indians, if it was Bosworth Smith in Manianwala who insulted its women. What I am attacking is the system. I have no quarrel with the Englishmen as such. I honour individuals among them to-day as I did before my discovery of the unimprovable-ness of the existing system. If anything, Mr. Andrews and other Englishmen I could name are nearer to me to-day than before. But I could not tender my homage even to him who is more than a brother to me, if he became the Viceroy of India. I would distrust his ability to

remain pure if he accepted the office. He would have to administer a system that is inherently corrupt and based on the assumption of our inferiority. ✓ Satan mostly employs comparatively moral instruments and the language of ethics, to give his aims an air of respectability.

I have digressed a little for the purpose of showing that this Government, if it was wholly manned by Indians but worked as it now is, would be as intolerable to us as it is now. Hence it is that the knowledge of Lord Sinha's appointment to a high office fails to fill me with a glow of satisfaction. We must have absolute equality in theory and in practice, and ability to do away with the British connection if we so wish.

But to revert to the lawyers and the law-courts, we cannot gain this desirable status so long as we regard with superstitious awe and wonder the so called palaces of justice. Let not individuals who get satisfaction of their greed or revenge or their just claims, be blind to the ultimate aim of these courts—the permanence of the authority of the Government which they represent. Without its law-courts the Government must perish in a day. I admit that under my plan this power of subjugating the people through the courts will still remain even when every Indian lawyer has withdrawn and there are no civil suits in the law-courts. But then they will cease to deceive us. They will have lost their moral prestige and therefore the air of respectability. ✓ It is strange but it is true that so long as we believed in the gradual transference of the power of the English to the people, appointments to high posts in the law-courts were hailed

as a blessing. Now that we believe that the system is incapable of being gradually mended, every such appointment by reason of its deceptiveness must be regarded as an evil.¹ Therefore every lawyer suspending his practice, to that extent undermines the prestige of the law-courts and to that extent every suspension is a gain for the individual as for the nation.

The economic drain that the law-courts cause has at no time been considered. And yet it is not a trifle. Every institution founded under the present system is run on a most extravagant scale. Law-courts are probably the most extravagantly run. I have some knowledge of the scale in England, a fair knowledge of the Indian, and an intimate knowledge of the South African. I have no hesitation in saying that the Indian is comparatively the most extravagant and bears no relation to the general economic condition of the people. The best South African lawyers—and they are lawyers of great ability—dare not charge the fees the lawyers in India do.² Fifteen guineas is almost a top fee for legal opinion. Several thousand rupees have been known to have been charged in India. There is something sinful in a system under which it is possible for a lawyer to earn from fifty thousand to one lac rupees per month.³ Legal practice is not—ought not to be—a speculative business. The best legal talent must be available to the poorest at reasonable rates. But we have copied and improved upon the practice of the English lawyers. Englishmen find the climate of India trying. The habits imbued under a cold and severe climate are retained in India, ample margin is kept for frequent migrations to the hills and to their island home

and an equally ample margin is kept for the education of an exclusive and aristocratic type for their children. The scale of their fees is naturally therefore pitched very high. But India cannot bear the heavy drain. We fancy that in order to feel the equals of these English lawyers, we must charge the same killing fees that the English do. It would be a sad day for India if it has to inherit the English scale and the English tastes so utterly unsuitable to the Indian environment. Any lawyer looking at the law-courts and the profession of law from the view points I have ventured to suggest, cannot keep coming to the conclusion that if he wants to serve the nation to the best of his ability, the first condition of service is suspension of his practice. He can come to a different conclusion only if he successfully changes the statement of facts I have made.

PRACTISING LAWYERS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 30, 1921.*)

The *Patrika* devotes a leading article to an examination of the position taken up by me regarding lawyers, and strongly dissents from it. The *Patrika* thinks that practising lawyers may continue to lead public opinion on Congress platform. I respectfully suggest that any such deviation from the non-co-operation resolution will be a serious mistake. I am aware that the *Patrika* thinks that the Congress has not called upon *all* lawyers to suspend practice. I venture to differ from

the interpretation. The resolution calls upon all lawyers to make greater effort to suspend practice. And, in my opinion, those lawyers who have not yet succeeded in suspending their practice, cannot expect to hold office in any Congress organisation or lead opinion on Congress platforms. Will titled men be elected as office bearers, although they may not have given up their titles? If we do not face the issues boldly, we stand in danger of corrupting the movement. We must exact correspondence between precept and practice. I hold that a lawyer president of Provincial Committee cannot lead his province to victory if he does not suspend his practice. He simply will not carry weight. I have noticed this again and again during my tours. Lawyers, who have hitherto led public opinion, have either renounced practice or public life.

The *Patrika* errs in comparing practising lawyers to merchants. Not many merchants have yet led public opinion, but where they have come forward they have certainly renounced dealing in foreign cloth. The public will not, I am glad to be able to say, tolerate divorce between profession and practice. But not to seek, or give up public position is one thing, and to help the movement as a weak but humble follower is another. Thousands are unable to carry out the full advice of the Congress and are yet eagerly helping as silent camp followers. That is the position that practising lawyers should take up.* It will be honourable, dignified, and

* The following note by M. K. Gandhi appeared in *Young India* of February 23, 1921 :—

How many lawyers and Students help :—Everywhere I have been

consistent. We may not, in our progress towards Swaraj, consider the lead of any class or individual as essential to success. . . .

Nor is the *Patrika* right in thinking that, before practising lawyers cease to be leaders, there should be a complete boycott of law-courts ; and as that is impossible without a rebel government, and as we do not contemplate rebellion, practising lawyers may safely lead opinion

asked whether lawyers and students who do not carry out the Congress resolution affecting them can help the movement in any other way The question is rather strange for it assumes that if a lawyer or a student cannot non-co-operate as such he cannot help at all. There are undoubtedly hundreds of students and scores of lawyers who are not suspending their normal studies or their practice, as the case may be, only out of weakness. A lawyer who cannot suspend practice can certainly help with money, he can give his spare hours to public service, he can introduce honesty and fair dealings in his profession, he can cease to consider clients as fit prey for his pecuniary ambition, he can cease to have anything to do with touts, he can promote settlement of cases by private arbitration, he can at least do spinning himself for one or two hours per day, he can simplify the life of his family, he can induce the members of the family to do spinning religiously for a certain time daily, he can adopt for himself and his family the use of Khaddar. These are only some of the things that can be done by every lawyer. Because a man cannot or will not carry out a particular part of the non-co-operation programme, he need not be shy about the other items. One thing a practising lawyer may not do, he may no longer figure as a leader on public platforms. He must be content to be a silent worker. What I have said about practising lawyers applies to students also who cannot or will not withdraw from schools. Most of our volunteers are drawn from the student world. Volunteering is a privilege and a student who has not been able to withdraw from Government schools cannot receive privileges from the nation. They too must be content to be unambitious servants of the nation. Even if we cannot completely boycott schools and colleges, we must destroy their prestige. That prestige has almost gone and is daily decreasing. And we must do nothing that would restore their prestige till they are nationalised and answer the requirements of the nation.

as hitherto. There is an obvious fallacy underlying this suggestion. Carried to its logical extent, it would mean that no leader need practise what he preaches. The fact is that although law courts may not be completely boycotted by the sacrifice of Messrs. Nehru and Das, by our refusal to give any public status to practising lawyers and others who have not carried out the Congress resolution, we have successfully demolished the prestige of these institutions, and, therefore, to that extent, of the Government. If we restore titled men, lawyers and others to their status even though they have not responded, we commit national suicide. Lastly, the *Patrika* is wrong in arguing that the Congress has called for suspension in order to secure the lawyers' services. The motive, as the preamble of the original resolution clearly states, is to undermine the Government's prestige by the non-co-operation of parties to the institutions on which the prestige is built.

COBBLERS *vs.* LAWYERS

(29th September, 1921.)

Babu Motilal Ghosh, whose mind is fresh like that of a youth though he is too frail even to move, summoned Maulana Mahomed Ali and me chiefly to urge us to invite the lawyers to the Congress fold and in effect to restore them to their original status of unquestioned leadership of public opinion. Both the Maulana and I told him that we did want the lawyers to work for the Congress, but that those who would not suspend practice could not and

should not become leaders. Moti Babu said that my mention of cobblers in the same breath as lawyers had offended some of them. I felt sorry to hear this. I remember the note * in these pages, and it was certainly not written to offend. I have said many hard things about lawyers, but I have never considered them to be guilty of caste prejudices. I am sure that the lawyers have appreciated the spirit of my remark. I hope I am never guilty of putting a sting in any of my writings. But I certainly meant no offence in the paragraph referred to by Moti Babu. Having been myself a lawyer, I could not so far forget myself as wantonly to offend members of the same profession. Nor can I forget the brilliant and unique services rendered to the country by lawyers such as Pheroze Shah Mehta, Ranade, Taiyabjee, Telang, Manomohan Ghose, Krishnaswami Iyer, not to speak of the living ones.

When no one else had the courage to speak, they were the voice of the people and guardians of their country's liberty. And, if to-day the majority of them are no

* The following is the note referred to —(August 25, 1921)

Practising Lawyers—Letters continue to pour in regarding practising lawyers holding offices in Congress Committees. Ever since my arrival in Bengal, the question has been still more pressingly put to me. An ex-student from Dhubri writes to ask whether I expect the movement to succeed under the leadership of practising lawyers. I cannot conceive the possibility of the movement, which is one of self-sacrifice, succeeding if it is led by lawyers who do not believe in self-sacrifice. I have not hesitated to advise that electors rather than be ably led by such lawyers should be content to be more humbly guided. I can certainly imagine a brave and believing weaver or cobbler more effectively leading than a timid and sceptical lawyer. Success depends upon bravery, sacrifice, truth, love and faith; not on legal acumen, calculation, diplomacy, hate and unbelief.)

longer accepted as leaders of the people, it is because different qualities are required for leadership from what they have exhibited hitherto. Courage, endurance, fearlessness and above all self-sacrifice are the qualities required of our leaders. A person belonging to the suppressed classes exhibiting these qualities in their fulness would certainly be able to lead the nation; whereas the most finished orator, if he have not these qualities, must fail.

And it has been a matter of keen satisfaction to me to find the lawyers all over India, who have not been able to suspend practice, readily assenting to the proposition and being content to work as humble camp followers. A general will find his occupation gone, if there were no camp followers in his army.

"But", said Moti Babu, "there is a great deal of intolerance that has crept into our movement. Non-co-operators insult those lawyers who have not suspended practice." I fear that the charge is true to a certain extent. Intolerance is itself a form of violence and an obstacle to the growth of a true democratic spirit. Arrogant assumption of superiority on the part of a non-co-operator who has undergone a little bit of sacrifice or put on *Khadi* is the greatest danger to the movement. A non-co-operator is nothing if he is not humble. When self-satisfaction creeps over a man, he has ceased to grow and therefore has become unfit for freedom. He who offers a little sacrifice from a lowly and religious spirit quickly realises the miserable littleness of it. Once on the path of sacrifice, we find out the measure of our selfishness, and must continually wish to give more and not be satisfied till there is a complete self-surrender.

And this knowledge of so little attempted and still less done must keep us humble and tolerant. It is our exclusiveness and the easy self-satisfaction that have certainly kept many a waverer away from us. Our motto must ever be conversion by gentle persuasion and a constant appeal to the head and the heart. We must therefore be ever courteous and patient with those who do not see eye to eye with us. We must resolutely refuse to consider our opponents as enemies of the country.

Lawyers and others who believe in non-co-operation but have not, from any cause, been able to non-co-operate in matters applicable to them, can certainly do silent work as lieutenants in the matter of Swadeshi.* It

* The following note by M. K. Gandhi appeared in *Young India*, January 12, 1922:—

About Lawyers—The Jammalal Bajaj fund of one lac of rupees that was given last year for the support of lawyers who had suspended practice as a result of the Nagpur resolution is nearly, as it was intended to be, exhausted. The lawyers cannot go back to practice with any show of decency, and I am sure that many will not countenance even the idea of a return when the country is showing such wonderful example of self-sacrifice. But it would not be proper to leave the lawyers to their own resources. I would therefore certainly suggest to the Provincial Committees that they should take up the burden subject to assistance from the central fund, if it was at all found necessary. The arrangement should be quickly made so as to avoid suspense and delay in the even tenor of national work.

This, however, is the least among the difficulties that surround the lawyer class at the present moment. They are eager to take part in the national awakening. The spirit is willing, the flesh is weak. I still feel that practising lawyers cannot lead. They cannot but weaken a movement which demands complete, almost reckless, sacrifice. The whole cause can be lost if top-men weaken at a supreme crisis. But the Congress has purposely opened an honourable door for them. The original draft was perhaps uncertain as to any but full non-co-operators being entitled to sign the volunteer pledge. The conditions for them are easy

requires the largest number of earnest workers. There is no reason why a practising lawyer should not make *Khadi* fashionable by wearing it even in courts. There is no reason why he and his family should not spin during leisure hours. I have mentioned one out of a variety of things that can be done by practising lawyers for the attainment of Swaraj. I hope, therefore, that no practising lawyer and for that matter no co-operating student will keep himself from serving the movement in every way open to him. All cannot become leaders, but all can be bearers. And non-co-operators, I hope, will always make it easy for such countrymen to offer and render service.

of fulfilment, being mostly matters of belief. The use of *Khadi* may cause some little inconvenience at first, but I feel sure that they will not mind it, if otherwise they believe in the requirements of the pledge. And, as among non-co-operators imprisonment covers a multitude of defects, practising lawyers who go through the fire of imprisonment will by that one fact come to occupy the position of honour which once was theirs. There is also the general resolution appealing to and inviting all including full co-operators to take up such activities as do not admit of any sacrifice or any difference of opinion. I hope therefore that lawyers will, to the best of their ability and opportunity, respond to the country's call in many of the various ways open to them. Where all are expected to help none should be found wanting or indifferent. Non-co-operators on their part instead of priding themselves upon their achievements should be humble enough to receive all the aid that might be rendered to the country's cause. The spirit of toleration should take the place of intolerance and exclusiveness. It can do no credit to the movement or good to the cause if a man, who has nothing or little to sacrifice, claims, by reason of his putting on *Khadi*, the right of slighting practising lawyers or others who may be honestly and according to their lights serving the country in various ways. Whatever is offered upon the altar of service to the motherland with a willing heart must be thankfully received,

iii. Boycott of Schools and National Education

BOYCOTT OF SCHOOLS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*August 11, 1920.*)

I feel that if we have not the courage to suspend the education of our children, we do not deserve to win the battle.

The first stage (in the programme of N-C-O) includes renunciation of honours or favours. As a matter of fact, no Government bestows favours without taking more than the favours are worth. It would be a bad and extravagant government which threw away its favours. In a government broad-based upon a people's will, we give our lives to secure a trinket which is a symbol of service. Under an unjust government which defies a people's will, rich *Jagirs* become a sign of servitude and dishonour. Thus considered, the schools must be given up without a moment's thought.

For me the whole scheme of non-co-operation is among other things a test of the intensity and extent of our feeling. Are we prepared to suffer? It has been said that we may not expect much response from title-holders, for they have never taken part in national affairs and have bought their honours at too great a price easily to sacrifice them. I make a present of the argument to the objectors, and ask what about the parents of school children and the grown up college students? They have no such

intimate connection with the Government as the title-holders. Do they or do they not feel enough to enable them to sacrifice the schooling?

But I contend that there is no sacrifice involved in emptying the schools. We must be specially unfit for non-co-operation if we are so helpless as to be unable to manage our own education to total independence of the Government*. Every village should manage the education of its own children. I would not depend upon Government aid. If there is a real awakening, the schooling need not be interrupted for a single day. The very schoolmasters who are now conducting Government schools, if they are good enough to resign their office, could take charge of national schools and teach our children the things they need, and not make of the majority of them indifferent clerks. I do look to the Aligarh College to

* The following appeared in *Young India* of November 17, 1920 :—
Though we would advocate and preach the boycott of schools and colleges, with as much vigour and earnestness as we do now, even if the whole cost of education were borne by Government, we state some facts and figures which will disillusion those who believe it is not possible to nationalise education without Government aid.

The total expenditure on Primary, Secondary and Higher Education, including all educational departments, for the year 1918-19 was Rs, 1,129 lacs or 11·29 crores. It was met as follows .—

			Lacs
Government Treasury	392
Local Funds	174
Municipal Funds		...	49
Fees	319
Public Funds	195
			<hr/>
			1,129
			<hr/>

give the lead in this matter. The moral effect created by the emptying of our Madrassas will be tremendous. I doubt not that the Hindu parents and scholars would not fail to copy their Mussalman brethren.

Indeed what could be grander education than that the parents and scholars should put religious sentiment before a knowledge of letters? If therefore no arrangement could be immediately made for the literary instruction of youths who might be withdrawn, it would be most profitable training for them to be able to work as volunteers for the cause which may necessitate their withdrawal from Government schools. For, as in the case of the lawyers, so in the case of the boys, my notion of withdrawal does not mean an indolent life. The withdrawing boys will, each according to his worth, be expected to take their share in the agitation.

Thus it will be seen that, while the Government spent 3 92 crores and the Municipalities and Local Boards Rs. 2 23 crores, the people spent from their own purse directly Rs. 5 16 crores. It may be noted that a good part of Government contribution was spent towards the upkeep of their own costly Educational Services.

If we take secondary education only, which is the chief item of expenditure and of usefulness, we shall have a further revelation. The total amount spent on this branch was Rs. 3 67 crores. It was met as follows.—

Of this less than $\frac{1}{4}$ th was spent by Government, little more than $\frac{1}{4}$ by Government and Municipalities combined, while the rest was borne by the people directly.

Do these figures not show that practically we ourselves finance the Governmental education system, while all along we entertain the hallucination that the Government does everything, and that we can, without Government aid, do nothing for ourselves? If we get rid of this hallucination and further decide upon curtailing the useless and costly paraphernalia, we can very easily make education independent of Government control, stand on its own legs and make improvements necessary to suit it to the needs of the country.

THE HALLUCINATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 29, 1920.)

Much is being said and written against the proposed boycott of Government-controlled schools and colleges. The proposal has been described as 'mischievous', 'harmful', opposed to the best interests of the country &c. ✓ Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji is amongst its most uncompromising opponents.

I have been taxing myself to the best of my capacity in order to discover my error. But the effort has resulted in deepening my conviction that it is sinful to receive any education under the control of the present Government, no matter how high its quality may be, even as it would be to take the richest milk when it is tainted with poison.

I ask myself why some see the truth of the proposition quite clearly whilst others, the accepted leaders, condemn it as an error. The answer I have been able to find is that the latter do not consider the present system of Government as an unmixed evil as the former do. In other words, the opponents do not sufficiently realise the significance of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs. They do not feel as the others do that these wrongs show conclusively that the sum total of the activity of the present Government is injurious to national growth. I know that this is a serious statement to make. ✓ It is unthinkable that Malaviyaji and Shastriar cannot feel the wrongs even as I do. And yet that

is precisely my meaning. I am positive that they will not put their children in a school where there was any likelihood of their becoming degraded instead of being elevated. I am equally positive that they would not send their children to a school managed, controlled or even influenced by a robber who had robbed them of their possessions. I feel that the nation's children suffer degradation in the Government schools. I feel that these schools and colleges are under the influence of a Government that has deliberately robbed the nation of its honour, and therefore the nation must withdraw its children from such schools. It may be that learning even in such schools may be able to resist the progress of degradation. But it cannot be right to countenance national humiliation going on in the schools because some have risen above their environment. In my opinion it is self-evident that the honoured leaders of the nation to-day do not realise that the Government-controlled schools are tainted in the manner described by me.

It may be urged that the schools are no worse to-day than they were before the Punjab wrong or the Khilafat breach, and that we tolerated them before these events. I admit that the schools are not much worse now than before. But so far as I am concerned, the knowledge of the Punjab and the Khilafat betrayal has revolutionized my view of the existing system of Government. My ignorance of its inherent wickedness made the system tolerable to the extent of my not rising against the schools. And that is just the reason why I fear that those who oppose the proposed boycott of the schools on the ground of its harmfulness, do not put the

same valuation on the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs that I do.

I have no hesitation in wishing that the youth of India, both boys and girls, will, if they have felt personally the deep humiliation of atrocities of the Punjab, or understood the meaning of the violation of the Khilafat pledge, without any further reflection, empty the Government-controlled schools and colleges. The moral education that they will gain in a moment when they take that step will more than make up for the temporary loss of literary education. For the day that the boys and the girls empty the Government-controlled schools will be the day that will mark a very definite advance towards the goal. It will mark a revolution in the national thought. It will mark our freedom from the hallucination of schools and colleges. Is not the nation able to take charge of its own education without any Government intervention, protection, advice or grant? Abandonment of the present schools means consciousness of our ability to educate ourselves in spite of Himalayan difficulties.

ALIGARH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 27, 1920.)

Aligarh is an old institution—forty five years old. It has unique traditions. It has a great record behind it. It may claim to have given to India the Ali Brothers. It is the best known centre of Islamic culture in India.

Why do I seek to destroy it? Some Mussalmans really

think that I mean ill under the pretence of wishing well to Aligarh. Little do they know that I am imploring Punditji to do to the Hindu University what I am asking the Trustees to do to Aligarh. And I am certainly going to plead with the Benares students as earnestly as I have with the Aligarh boys. I have done the same with the Khalsa College. The latter is the only centre of Sikh culture.

✓ I do desire passionately to destroy all these three institutions as they are, and would strive to raise purer and truer ones instead.

I deny that these institutions are in any way true representatives of their respective cultures. Inasmuch as Islam is in peril at English hands, Hinduism and Sikhism are also in peril. I asked an Aligarh professor whether he could preach complete independence for India as her goal if necessary, or if the institution as such could refuse to receive a Governor in his official capacity. He frankly admitted that it was not possible. And yet I make bold to say that to-day the vast majority of the students of India have no regard or respect for British rule. They are disgusted with it. They have certainly no genuine affection for it. I venture to submit that to keep our boys in this false atmosphere is to teach them to deny their faith and for us to do violence to our respective cultures. *We will not make a nation out of hypocrites.*

✓ With the knowledge we have of British intentions, it is unmanly—un-Indian for us to accept even a portion of our own money through hands stained with the blood of the innocents at Jallianwalla. We may as well accept gifts from a robber who has robbed us of our property.

This Government has robbed us of our honour and put one of our religions in peril. In my humble opinion, it is a sin for the nation to receive education in schools financed by or under the influence or control of the Government.

I have therefore no hesitation in advising immediate destruction of these institutions at all cost. But if the trustees, the teachers and the parents or the boys will act in unison, there is no cost to be paid and everything to be gained.

I am asking for the form to be changed. I do not seek to destroy the soul. Even as we leave bodies which we have outgrown, so must we leave the institutions which we have outgrown, and bring into being others more in accord with our needs. How can scholastic institutions which represent the youth of a nation, lag behind when the nation is marching forward? Several high schools having a more or less distinguished record have thrown off the yoke of grant and affiliation in Gujarat. They are none the worse for it. They are all the purer for it. The principals and the trustees can train the youth under their charge in a freer atmosphere.

Financial considerations deter those who do not want to work. Our institutions will collapse if the teachers or the trustees are false to their trust, or the nation really does not want them. The programme of non-co-operation is based on the belief that the nation is tired of the present government and wants to change it without resorting to methods of violence. The experience so far gained shows that the nation does definitely desire the change. If there is failure or delay, it will be due to want of workers.

TO THE TRUSTEES OF THE ALIGARH
COLLEGE

(October 27, 1920.)

Gentlemen,

I know you are about to meet in order to give your decision on a most momentous issue for Islam and India. I hear that you are calling in the aid of the Government and the police for the occasion of your meeting. If the rumour is true you would be making a grievous mistake. In a matter which is purely domestic you need neither the intervention of the Government nor the protection of its police. Neither the Ali brothers nor I are engaged in brute war. We are engaged in a war in which our only weapon is force of public opinion and we shall reckon ourselves beaten in the battle if we do not carry the public with us. In the present dispute the test of public opinion will be in the first instance your majority. Therefore, if you after a full and free discussion decide by a majority, that the college and school students may not remain in the college ground either as students or even as boarders if they persist in their demand of disaffiliation and the rejection of the Government grant, they will be peacefully withdrawn. We propose in that event to carry on their education if at all possible in Aligarh itself, or elsewhere. The desire is not to suspend their secular education for one moment longer than is absolutely necessary. But it is our sincere desire that it should be given in consistence with the law of Islam and the honour of India. I understand that in the opinion of the recognised Ulemas it is not lawful for

a believing Muslim to receive the assistance of a Government that has desired or indirectly sought to cause the destruction of the holy Khilafat and to tamper with the exclusive Muslim control of Jazirat-ul-Arab. You know as well as I do, how this Government has wilfully trampled under foot Indian honour. Consistently, therefore, with the control of the passions by the people, all voluntary association with the Government is being withdrawn by the people. The least that you, in my humble opinion, can do is to decline any further Government grant, disaffiliate the great institution of which you are the trustees and reject the charter of the Moslem University. The least that the Aligarh boys can do, if you fail to respond to the call of Islam and India, is to wash their hands clean of an institution acknowledging the ægis of a Government that has forfeited all title to the allegiance of Islam and India and to bring into being a larger, nobler and purer Aligarh that would carry out the inmost wishes of its great founder. I cannot imagine the late illustrious Sir Syed Ahmed keeping his noble creation under the control or influence of the present Government.

As I have been the originator of the idea of disaffiliation of Aligarh and rejection of the Government grant, I feel that I might be able to assist you in your discussions, and therefore, offer my humble services to you, and gladly attend your meeting if you will allow me to do so. I am proceeding to Bombay and shall await your answer there.

But whether you wish me to attend or not, I hope that you will not summon Government intervention in this purely domestic matter.

And let me say to the Government through you, that one hears all sorts of rumours of their intentions about the Ali Brothers and myself. I hope, for the peaceful evolution of the struggle they will not restrict our liberty. We are endeavouring in a most constitutional manner to conduct our propaganda. We are seeking to bend the Government to the people's will, or if it will not, to overthrow it, not by brute force but by creating real public opinion. We hold it to be perfectly constitutional, legitimate and honourable to expose the satanic nature of the Government, and to ask the people by appealing to their heads and their hearts, never to their animal passions, to express their will, not in words but in action, *i.e.*, by withdrawing all possible association with the Government. But if the Government wish even to suppress the liberty of opinion and peaceful action, I hope they will issue no internment orders against us, but that they will imprison us. For, in spite of our sincere desire not to offer civil disobedience even in our own persons, it will not be possible for us to respect any internment orders. So long as our movements are not physically restrained, we must use it in such a manner as we consider to be the best in the interests of our mission.

With humble apology,

Your faithful servant,

M. K. GANDHI.

TO THE PARENTS OF ALIGARH BOYS

(November 3, 1920.)

Gentlemen,

I know that the best of my friends are bewildered at many of my doings at the present moment, not the least among which is my advice to the youth of the country. I do not wonder at their bewilderment. I have undergone a complete transformation in my attitude towards the system of government under which we are labouring. To me it is satanic even as was the system under *Ravan's* rule according to the scriptures of my religion. But my friends are not so convinced as I am of the supreme necessity of ending this rule, unless the system undergoes a radical change and there is definite repentance on the part of the rulers.

I share too your concern about your boys who are learning at Aligarh. You will believe me when I tell you that I do not wish to hurt your feelings. I am myself the father of four boys whom I have brought up to the best of my lights. I have been an extremely obedient son to my parents, and an equally obedient pupil to my teachers. I know the value of filial duty. But I count duty to God above all these. And in my opinion, the time has come for every young man and young woman in this country to make their choice between duty to God and duty to others. I claim to know the youth of our country in a fairly intimate manner. I know that in the majority of cases the youth of our country have the determining of their higher education in their own hands. I know cases in which parents find it difficult to wean

their children from what to them (the parents) appears to be the infatuation of their children about higher education. I am convinced that I am doing no violence to the feelings of parents when I address our young men and ask them to leave their schools or colleges even in spite of their parents.) You will not be astonished to learn that of the parents of hundreds of boys who have left schools or colleges, I have received only one protest and that from a government servant whose boys have left their college. The protest is based on the ground that they were not even consulted before their boys decided to leave their college. In fact my advice to the boys was even to discuss with their parents the question of leaving before arriving at a decision.

I have myself appealed to thousands of parents at scores of meetings at which hardly a parent has objected to the proposition of leaving government controlled schools. Indeed they have with wonderful unanimity passed resolutions on non-co-operation including the item on schools. I therefore take leave to think that the parents of the Aligarh boys are no less convinced than the others of the necessity of withdrawing their children from schools and colleges supported or controlled by a Government that has participated in betraying the Mussalmans of India and has wantonly humiliated the nation through its barbarous treatment of the Punjab.

I hope you know that I am as eager as any that our boys' education should not be neglected. But I am certainly more eager that their education is received through clean hands. I hold it to be unmanly for us to continue to receive grants for our education from a

government which we heartily dislike. In my humble opinion that would be even dishonourable and disloyal.

Is it not better that our children should receive their education in a free atmosphere, even though it may be given in humble cottages or in the shade of trees and under teachers who, being themselves free, would breathe into our children the spirit of freedom? I wish you could realise that the destiny of our beloved land lies not in us, the parents, but in our children. Shall we not free them from the curse of slavery which has made us crawl on our bellies? Being weak we may not have the strength or the will even to throw off the yoke. But shall we not have the wisdom not to leave the cursed inheritance to our children?

They can lose nothing by pursuing their studies as free lads and lasses. Surely they do not need government university degrees. And if we could but get rid of the love of government degrees for our boys the question of finding money for their education is in reality simple. For a week's self-denial by the nation will provide for the education of its school-going children for one year. Our existing religious and charitable Hindu and Muslim funds can support our education without even a week of self-denial. The present effort is no more than an attempt to take a referendum of our capacity to govern ourselves and to protect our religions and our honour.

I remain,
Well wisher of the youth of India,
M. K. GANDHI

TO YOUNG BENGAL

(January 19, 1921.)

Dear Young Friends,

I have just read an account of your response to the nation's call. It does credit to you and to Bengal. I had expected no less. I certainly expect still more. Bengal has great intelligence, it has a greater heart, it has more than its share of the spiritual heritage for which our country is specially noted. You have more imagination, more faith and more emotion than the rest of India. You have falsified the calumny of cowardice on more occasions than one. There is, therefore, no reason why Bengal should not lead now as it has done before now.

You have taken the step; you will not recede. You had ample time to think. You have paused, you have considered. You held the Congress that delivered to the nation the message of non-co-operation, *i.e.* of self-purification, self-sacrifice, courage and hope. The Nagpur Congress ratified, clarified, and amplified the first declaration. It was delivered in the midst of strife, doubt, and disunion. It was redelivered in the midst of joy, acclamation, and practically perfect unanimity. It was open to you to refuse or to hesitate to respond. You have chosen the better, though, from a worldly-wise standpoint, less cautious way. You dare not go back without hurting yourselves and the cause.

But for the evil spell that the existing system of government and, most of all, this Western education has cast upon us, the question will not be considered as open to argument. Can the brave Arabs retain their independence

and yet be schooled under the aegis of those who would hold them under bondage? They will laugh at a person who dared to ask them to go to schools that may be established by their invaders. Is the case different, or if it is different, is it not stronger in our case when we are called upon to give up schools conducted under the aegis of a government which rightly or wrongly we seek to bend to our will or destroy?

We cannot get *Swaraj* if not one class in the country is prepared to work and sacrifice for it. The Government will yield not to the logic of words. It knows no logic but that of brave and true deeds.)

Bravery of the sword they know. And they have made themselves proof against its use by us. Many of them will welcome violence on our part. They are unconquerable in the art of meeting and suppressing violence. We propose, therefore, to sterilize their power of inflicting violence by our non-violence. Violence dies when it ceases to evoke response from its object. Non-violence is the corner-stone of the edifice of non-co-operation. You will, therefore, not be hasty or over-zealous in your dealings with those who may not see eye to eye with you. Intolerance * is a species of violence and therefore against

* Mr. Gandhi writes of the intolerance of students in *Young India* of February 2, 1921 as follows.—

SITTING DHURNA.

Some students of Calcutta have revived the ancient form of barbarity in the form of 'sitting dhurna'. Fortunately, the practice was stopped as soon as it was revived. They blocked the passage of their fellow students who wanted to go to the University for paying their fees or to see some officials of the educational department. I call it 'barbarity' for it is a crude way of using coercion. It is also cowardly because one who sits

our creed. Non-violent non-co operation is an object lesson in democracy. The moment we are able to ensure non-violence, even under circumstances the most provoking, that moment we have achieved our end ; because that is the moment when we can offer complete non-co-operation.

I ask you not to be frightened at the proposition just stated. People do not move in arithmetical progression, not even in geometrical progression. They have been known to perish in a day; they have been known to rise in a day. Is it such a difficult thing for India to realise that thirty crores of human beings have but to feel their strength and they can be free without having to use it? As we had not regained national consciousness, the rulers have hitherto played us against one another. We have to refuse to do so, and we are masters, not they.

Non-co-operation deals first with those sensitive classes upon whom the government has acted so successfully and

'dhurna' knows that he is not going to be trampled over. It is difficult to call the practice violent but it is certainly worse. If we fight our opponent we at least enable him to return the blow. But when we challenge him to walk over us, we *knowing* that he will not, we place him in a most awkward and humiliating position. I know that the over-zealous students who sat *dhurna* never thought of the barbarity of the deed. But one, who is expected to follow the voice of conscience and stand even single-handed in the face of odds, cannot afford to be thoughtless. Non-co-operation, if it fails, will fail only through internal weakness. There is no such thing as defeat in non-co-operation. It never fails. Its so called representatives may so badly represent their cause that it may appear to the spectators to have failed. Let non-co-operationists therefore beware of everything they do. There must be no impatience, no barbarity, no insolence, no undue pressure. If we want to cultivate a true spirit of democracy, we cannot afford to be intolerant. Intolerance betrays want of faith in one's cause.

who have been lured into the trap consciously or unconsciously as the school-going youths have been.

When we come to think about it, the sacrifice required is infinitesimal for individuals, because the whole is distributed among so many of us. For what is your sacrifice? To suspend your literary studies for one year or till Swaraj is established. If I could 'infect' the whole of the student world with my faith, I know that the suspension of studies need not extend even to a year.

And in the place of your suspended studies I would urge you to study the methods of bringing about Swaraj as quietly as possible even within the year of grace. I present you with the spinning wheel and suggest to you that on it depends India's economic salvation.

But you are at liberty to reject it if you wish and go to the college that has been promised to you by Mr. Das. Most of your fellow-students in the National College at Gujarat have undertaken to give at least four hours to spinning every day. It is no sacrifice to learn a beautiful art and to be able to clothe the naked at the same time.

You have done your duty by withdrawing from Government colleges. I have only showed you the easiest and the most profitable way of devoting the time at your disposal.

May God give you strength and courage to sustain you in your determination.

Your well-wisher,

M. K. GANDHI.

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT IN CALCUTTA

(January 26, 1921.)

The response of the students of the Calcutta colleges to the programme of non-co-operation has been as striking as it was sudden. Till the 15th of January, there was no news from Calcutta that could have possibly led one to expect the great things that have since happened. The primordial beginning of this phase of the movement is wrapt in mystery, but the fact of Mr. C. R. Das giving up his enormous practice in response to the nation's call, certainly hastened events. On the 15th—to use an old phrase—‘things just happened’. The students of the Bangabansi College came out in a body—except for a few waverers and objectors, and with shouts of *Bande Mataram* they proceeded towards the Ripon College, to appeal to their brethren there to come out. The appeal did not fall on deaf ears; there was an answering chorus—an echo of *Bande Mataram*—the students left their classes and poured out of Ripon College, like bees from a hive, to join those outside.

Thus did the movement start among the students, but now it numbers thousands: the lowest estimate puts the number of students who have come out, at 8,000; and the average at 15,000. As a little stream of water, that trickles through the rocks at its source, becomes a magnificent river—of huge expanse—near its mouth, so has the movement of non-co-operation progressed among the students of Calcutta. There is not one college there that is not affected, while some, like the St. Xavier's College, have been forced to give ‘a holiday’ to their students ‘till

further notice.' If the response of the under-graduates has been so striking and magnificent, the law and post-graduate students have shown an even more patriotic spirit. Of 700 law students who appeared on the first day of their University examination, only 150, it is said, appeared on the second day.

More meetings are being held in Calcutta in a day than were held ordinarily in a month. Mr. C. R. Das had to speak at as many as eight meetings in a day. It is not surprising, therefore, that the magnificent response of the students should have quickened the pulse of the political life of Calcutta. A National College was opened last week with over 800 students on its rolls and more were joining hourly. The movement has not ended here; it has stirred the mind of the country, it has vividly brought home to every Indian the message of the Congress. Echoes of it are being heard all over the province. The students of Pubna, Berhampore, and Dacca, of Seragunj, Comilla, and Bazerghat have not been slow to respond.....Bengal is in the melting pot. Let us hope that it will be purified. The students seem determined and resolute. May God give them the strength to win!

THE DUTY OF STUDENTS

(February 9, 1921.)

[The following is the address delivered to the students and professors of the Calcutta National College by Mr. Gandhi on the occasion of the opening ceremony on February 4, 1921. A hymn from the Gita was sung by a number of boys at the commencement.]

Friends,—You have just now heard the beautiful prayer sung by the students over there, and I hope that all of

you will ponder over the magnificent language of that prayer. If we will base all our acts in this Institution on prayer, I have very little doubt that we shall come through with added glory to ourselves and to our country. I have had the privilege, during these few months, of opening several institutions in several parts of India. But I must confess to you that in opening no other institution have I been so weighed down with anxiety and fear as I am in performing the opening ceremony in connection with this Institution. As I have elsewhere remarked, all the eyes, all the attention of the student world are centred upon Calcutta. You have seen so many telegrams reproduced in the press, I have seen many more telegrams not reproduced in the press, congratulating the students on the magnificent response to the country's call. You may have also noticed that as a result of your response, the students all over India are withdrawing themselves from Government institutions. Great, therefore, is your responsibility and the responsibility of the professors and teachers connected with this Institution, of Mr. Das and myself also. For myself, I can only assure you that my prayers will attend all your efforts in making this Institution a success. But I know that no prayer that I can offer, no prayer that our clearer hearts can offer can be of the slightest service unless the students approach their task in humility and in their fear of God, with perseverance, with single-mindedness and with love and a devotion for the country in whose name and for whose sake they have abandoned Government institutions. It is not a light task for a student expecting certificates of high merit, expecting a great career in his own estimation. It is no

light task for a student with all these expectations to surrender them in the hope that he is rendering a service to the country and therefore a service to himself. Personally I have not the slightest doubt about it. I hope you will never have to regret the day that you left Government institutions. But I know also that you must have to regret the day if you will not use your time usefully, if you have left under the impulse of moment as so many of our leaders who mean well of the country have already expressed their fears. Let me hope that you will falsify their fears.

You will at the end of the year have so discharged yourselves that those who are to-day filled with doubts may come forward with an expression of opinion that their doubts were misplaced. Let me not conceal from you, the students of Calcutta, what certificate Indians in other parts of India give to you. Many of the students and many grown up men also, who have talked to me about your movement have expressed a sense of nervous fear. You have been credited with a great deal of emotion, you have been credited with a great deal of impulsiveness, but you have not been credited with the same amount of perseverance and industry.

BE TRUE TO YOUR TRUST

You are embarking upon a new career. You are turning over a new leaf. You are shouldering a great responsibility. You are counting yourselves among the makers of India of the future. And if you realise this responsibility, I have no doubt you will dispel all these fears which have been expressed in other parts of India.

Those who know Bengal well are in a position also to testify that Bengalis on many an occasion have not been found wanting ; and for my part I shall certainly decline to believe that those students who have responded and who will join this institution will be found wanting. I shall hope also that the professors and the teachers will prove true to their trust. What I said in all humility to the professors and teachers at the time of performing the opening ceremony of the Gujarat National College, I am tempted to repeat here : that the success and failure of this institution will very largely depend upon the honest exertion that the professors and teachers may put forth. At this critical moment in the history of our dear country, every one of us, who intends to mould the young mind of the country, has a serious responsibility, and if the professors and the teachers are found asleep, if they are overtaken with doubt, if they are overtaken with fear as to the future, God help the students who come under their charge. And I shall pray to the Almighty that he may bless the professors and teachers with wisdom, with courage, with faith and with hope.

Om

ESCHEW ALL VIOLENCE

I have in one of my speeches told the students that whilst they might go on with the course that they have mapped out for themselves they must not interfere with others. You have perhaps read the paragraph that appeared in the newspaper to-day with reference to Barisal.* I do not know whether it is an exaggerated

* The reference to Barisal is in connection with the alleged obstruction of students still attending their classes by non-co-operationist students catching hold of the formers' feet and other methods.

account of what had happened there. I do not care whether it is an exaggeration, and whether it is an under-statement, but it furnishes a lesson for you and for me that we must on no account resort to violence, that we must on no account exert undue pressure. And as I said at one of the meetings day before yesterday, I hope that the students will not sit *dhurna*—they will not exercise any pressure whatsoever upon those students who would not come out of the schools and colleges. It is sufficient that those who feel it is sinful to belong to these institutions ought to come out of them. If we have sufficient faith in ourselves we shall remain steadfast although not a single other student responds to the call. It does betray want of faith in our own mission when you become impatient. And if we are impatient we begin to compel others to do what we have done. I hope no one of the students who will belong to this institution will be filled with any such doubt as to the correctness of his conduct.

RAVAGE THROUGH THE HIDDEN TREASURES OF HINDUSTANI

I hope also that when I renew your acquaintance a month hence, as I hope I shall be able to do, you will not call upon me to address you any longer in English but that you will have mastered sufficient Hindustani to be able to understand whatever message I might have to give to you in our national common language. I assure you when you approach your study of Hindustani some of you will find it simple and easy. To some of you the words will seem perfectly natural, because the

vocabulary is common to Bengali, Hindi and most of the Indian languages, barring the Dravidian stock. You will find also it will feed your intellect and it will satisfy all the intellectual requirements of intellectual Bengal. And if you want to go in for literature, I promise you will find treasures hidden both in Hindi and Urdu whatever scripts you take up—and whatever books you take up first. You talk of the poverty of Hindi literature—you talk of the poverty of to-day's Hindi, but if you dive deep into the pages of Tulsidas, probably you will share my opinion that there is no other book that stands equal to it in the literature of the world in modern languages. The one book has given me faith and hope which no other book has given. I think that it is a book which can stand any criticism and any scrutiny alike in literary grace, in metaphor and in religious fervour.)

AND OF SPINNING

I hope also that when I come back you will have have made sufficient progress in making yarn and have it woven by some village weaver for your own use. But I hope that you will be able to give sufficient proof of what wonders you have performed in spinning and I hope you will be able to share with me the same poetry and the same intellectual treat that I find in spinning if you spin with faith and hope with reference to the future of India. I hope also that your professors and teachers will give their lectures through Bengali, and I hope that all the knowledge that you have acquired in your Government institutions, you will translate for yourselves in Bengali and that you will be able to find equivalent

expressions for the richest thought that you have learnt from English poets and from English literature.

HAVE FAITH

I hope also that you will approach your task with a religious faith. If this movement of ours is not religious, I am free to confess to you that this movement will not only fail but it will discredit us. It is a new method of applying ourselves to the task and if we consider that we can solve the problem of India by bringing some changes only upon the old methods, we shall be doomed to disappointment. If you approach the task with the same religious fervour for which Bengal is noted, I know you will find that Swaraj is within easy reach. May God help you. May God help the professors, and may God give you the strength that our friend Sriji Chitta Ranjan Das needs. I have much pleasure in declaring this Institution open.

EDUCATION AND NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1921.)

To the Editor, *Young India* Sir,—In the Karti issue of the *Pravasi*, a Bengali monthly edited by the reputed journalist, Mr. Ramananda Chatterjee, appears an article over the initials S. C. on the present educational activities of Russia. In this article occurs a passage to which I wish to draw your attention. I am translating it below.

"But even under the stress of the present upheavals, Russia has kept burning her torch of learning, faint though it is. None has advised her, like the wise patriots of our country (India), to let education wait. Russia knows that no vital antagonism (incompatibility) exists between war and education, as exists between water and oil."

I apologise for the bad rendering, but this is the idea contained in the few Bengali lines I refer to.

I do not exactly understand what the writer means by these lines and as Mr. Gandhi is one of the "wise patriots who have advised us to let education wait", I would respectfully request him to express his views on the above passage, as such a view is held by a section of the community which declares itself to be "sane" and "rational."

Yours etc.,

Puruha.

Phanindranath Dasgupta.

I am not surprised at the view expressed in the *Pravasi*. In my humble opinion it betrays at once ignorance of the position of the 'wise patriots' and a distorted view of education. The Russians are not non-co-operating with their existing institutions. And yet in a state of war there too 'the torch of learning was burning faint' even as in non-co-operation schools. But what happened in England when it was at war with Germany? How many schools were then going on in England? I know that the Inns of Court and many colleges were practically closed. I know that during the Boer War not a Boer child had literary education. The Boer children's education consisted in suffering for the sake of their country. The fact is that the present peaceful movement is so silent and gentle on the whole, that it is possible for those who do not believe in the doctrine to continue the education of their children under a system against which the country is 'waging war.' That the movement is the more effective for its gentleness will, I prophesy, be recorded by the future historian with grateful appreciation. Lastly we have little reason to be proud of our educational institutions which by their very nature are accessible to a mere fringe of our population. In our state of intoxication we do not perceive the disastrous effect of the present system of education on

the country. I have taxed myself to find some thing to the credit of the system in the way of a solution of the vital problems affecting the country ; I have failed to find a single thing of that character. There are to-day 7,851,946 children receiving instruction in our schools. I claim that it is impossible under the present system even to double the number of learners during the next fifty years. If education is to be universal, the system will have to be revised out of all recognition. This is possible only by non-co-operation. Public conscience cannot be stung into quickness with a milder remedy.

A PARENT'S DUTY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 15, 1921.)

This year, my third son aged 21 years has passed his B. A. with honours at an enormous expense. He does not wish to enter Government service. He wants to take up national service only. My family consists of twelve members. I have still to educate five boys. I had an estate which has been sold to pay a debt of Rs. 2000. In educating my three sons, I have spent all my earnings and all this in the hope that my third son would secure the highest degree in the University, and then try to retrieve the position I have almost lost. I had expected him to be able to take up the whole burden of my family. But now I am almost led to think that I must give my family up to ruin. There is a conflict of duties on the one hand and motives on the other. I seek your careful consideration and advice.

This is a typical letter. And it is the universality, almost, of the attitude, that set me against the present system of education years ago, and made me change the course of the education of all my boys and others with

(in my opinion) excellent results. The hunt after position and status has ruined many a family, and has made many depart from the path of rectitude. Who does not know what questionable things fathers of families in need of money for their children's education have considered it their duty to do? I am convinced that we are in for far worse times, unless we change the whole system of our education. We have only touched the fringe of an ocean of children. The vast mass of them remain without education, not for want of will but of ability and knowledge on the part of the parents. There is something radically wrong, especially for a nation so poor as ours, when parents have to support so many grown up children, and give them a highly expensive education without the children making any immediate return. I can see nothing wrong in the children, from the very threshold of their education, paying for it in work. The simplest handicraft suitable for all, required for the whole of India, is undoubtedly spinning along with the previous processes. If we introduced this in our educational institutions, we should fulfil three purposes, make education self-supporting, train the bodies of the children as well as their minds, and pave the way for a complete boycott of foreign yarn and cloth. Moreover, the children thus equipped will become self-reliant and independent. I would suggest to the correspondent that he should invite all the members of his family to contribute to its upkeep by spinning or weaving. Under my scheme, no child is entitled to education, who does not spin a minimum quantity of yarn. Such families will acquire a prestige for self-respect and independence not hitherto dreamt of.

This scheme does not exclude a liberal education, but on the contrary brings it within the easy reach of every boy or girl, and restores literary training to its original dignity by making it primarily a means of mental and moral culture, and only secondarily and indirectly a means of livelihood.

NATIONAL EDUCATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 1, 1921.)

So many strange things have been said about my views on national education, that it would perhaps not be out of place to formulate them before the public.

In my opinion the existing system of education is defective, apart from its association with an utterly unjust Government, in three most important matters :—

- (1) It is based upon foreign culture to the almost entire exclusion of indigenous culture,
- (2) It ignores the culture of the heart and the hand, and confines itself simply to the head,
- (3) Real education is impossible through a foreign medium.

Let us examine the three defects. Almost from the commencement, the text-books deal, not with things the boys and the girls have always to deal with in their homes, but things to which they are perfect strangers. It is not through the text-books that a lad learns what is right and what is wrong in the home life. He is never taught to have any pride in his surroundings. The higher

he goes, the farther he is removed from his home, so that at the end of his education he becomes estranged from his surroundings. He feels no poetry about the home life. The village scenes are all a sealed book to him. His own civilisation is presented to him as imbecile, barbarous, superstitious and useless for all practical purposes. His education is calculated to wean him from his traditional culture. And if the mass of educated youths are not entirely denationalised, it is because the ancient culture is too deeply embedded in them to be altogether uprooted even by an education adverse to its growth. If I had my way, I would certainly destroy the majority of the present text-books and cause to be written text-books which have a bearing on and correspondence with the home life, so that a boy as he learns may react upon his immediate surroundings.

Secondly, whatever may be true of other countries, in India at any rate where more than eighty per cent. of the population is agricultural and another ten per cent. industrial, it is a crime to make education merely literary, and to unfit boys and girls for manual work in after life. Indeed I hold that as the larger part of our time is devoted to labour for earning our bread, our children must from their infancy be taught the dignity of such labour. Our children should not be so taught as to despise labour. There is no reason why a peasant's son after having gone to a school should become useless, as he does become, as agricultural labourer. It is a sad thing that our school boys look upon manual labour with disfavour, if not contempt. Moreover, in India, if we expect, as we must, every boy and girl of school going age to attend public schools,

we have not the means to finance education in accordance with the existing style nor are millions of parents able to pay the fees that are at present imposed. Education to be universal must therefore be free. I fancy that even under an ideal system of government, we shall not be able to devote two thousand million rupees which we should require for finding education for all the children of school going age. It follows, therefore, that our children must be made to pay in *labour* partly or wholly for all the education they receive. Such universal labour to be profitable can only be (to my thinking) hand-spinning and hand-weaving. But for the purposes of my proposition, it is immaterial whether we have spinning or any other form of labour, so long as it can be turned to account. Only, it will be found upon examination that on a practical, profitable and extensive scale, there is no occupation other than the processes connected with cloth production which can be introduced in our schools throughout India.

The introduction of manual training will serve a double purpose in a poor country like ours. It will pay for the education of our children and teach them an occupation on which they can fall back in after-life, if they choose, for earning a living. Such a system must make our children self-reliant. Nothing will demoralise the nation so much as that we should learn to despise labour.

One word only as to the education of the heart. I do not believe that this can be imparted through books. It can only be done through the living touch of the teacher. And, who are the teachers in the primary and even secondary schools? Are they men and women of faith and character? Have they themselves received the

training of the heart? Are they even expected to take care of the permanent element in the boys and girls placed under their charge? Is not the method of engaging teachers for lower schools an effective bar against character? Do the teachers get even a living wage? And we know that the teachers of primary schools are not selected for their patriotism. They only come who cannot find any other employment.

Finally, the medium of instruction. My views on this point are too well known to need restating. The foreign medium has caused brain fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them for filtrating their learning to the family or the masses. The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. It is the greatest tragedy of the existing system. The foreign medium has prevented the growth of our vernaculars. If I had the powers of a despot, I would to-day stop the tuition of our boys and girls through a foreign medium, and require all the teachers and professors on pain of dismissal to introduce the change forthwith. I would not wait for the preparation of text-books. They will follow the change. It is an evil that needs a summary remedy.

My uncompromising opposition to the foreign medium has resulted in an unwarranted charge being levelled against me of being hostile to foreign culture or the learning of the English language. No reader of *Young India* could have missed the statement often made by me that I regard English as the language of inter-

national commerce and diplomacy, and therefore consider its knowledge on the part of some of us as essential. As it contains some of the richest treasures of thought and literature, I would certainly encourage its careful study among those who have linguistic talents and expect them to translate those treasures for the nation in its vernaculars.

Nothing can be farther from my thought than that we should become exclusive or erect barriers. But I do respectfully contend that an appreciation of other cultures can fitly follow, never precede, an appreciation and assimilation of our own. It is my firm opinion that no culture has treasures so rich as ours has. We have not known it, we have been made even to deprecate its study and depreciate its value. We have almost ceased to live it.) An academic grasp without practice behind it is like an embalmed corpse, perhaps lovely to look at but nothing to inspire or ennoble. My religion forbids me to belittle or disregard other cultures, as it insists, under pain of civil suicide, upon imbibing and living my own.

THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF GUJARAT

(November 17, 1920.)

By establishing a University and starting a college at Ahmedabad, Gujarat has shown that non-co-operation has a constructive side as well. Only, being a purifying process, non-co-operation has to destroy before it can construct. The National University stands to-day as a protest against British injustice, and as a vindication of

national honour. But it has come to stay. It draws its inspiration from the national ideals of a united India. It stands for a religion which is the Dharma of the Hindus and Islam of Mohamedans. It wants to rescue the Indian vernaculars from unmerited oblivion and make them the fountains of national regeneration and Indian culture. It holds that a systematic study of Asiatic cultures is no less essential than the study of Western sciences for a complete education for life. The vast treasures of Sanskrit and Arabic, Persian and Pali, and Magadhi have to be ransacked in order to discover wherein lies the source of strength for the nation. It does not propose merely to feed on, or repeat, the ancient cultures. It rather hopes to build a new culture based on the traditions of the past, enriched by the experience of later times. It stands for the synthesis of the different cultures that have come to stay in India, that have influenced Indian life, and that, in their turn, have themselves been influenced by the spirit of the soil. This synthesis will naturally be of the Swadeshi type where each culture is assured its legitimate place, and not of American pattern, where one dominant culture absorbs the rest, and where the aim is not towards harmony, but towards an artificial and forced unity. That is why the University has desired a study of all the Indian religions by its students. The Hindus may thus have an opportunity of studying the Koran and the Muslims of knowing what the Hindu Shastras contain. If the University has excluded anything, it is the spirit of exclusion that regards any section of humanity as permanently untouchable. The study of Hindustani, which is a national blend of Sanskrit, Hindi and Persianised Urdu, has been made

compulsory. The spirit of independence will be fostered not only through Religion, Politics, and History, but through vocational training also, which alone can give the youths of the country economic independence and a back-bone that comes out of a sense of self-respect. The University hopes to organise higher schools throughout the mofussil towns, so that education may be spread broad-cast and filtered down to the masses as early as possible. The use of Gujrati as the medium of education will facilitate this process and, ere long, the suicidal cleavage between the educated and the non-educated will be bridged. And as an effect of industrial education to the genteel folks, and literary education for the industrial classes, the unequal distribution of wealth and the consequent social discontent will be considerably checked. The greatest defect of the Government Universities has been their alien control and the false values they have created as regards 'careers.' The Gujarat University by non-co-operating with the Government has automatically eradicated both these evils from its own system. If the founders and promoters stick to this resolve till the Government becomes nationalised, it will help them to cultivate a clear perception of national ideals and national needs. Let us pray to God that the workers get the necessary faith and strength to uphold the banner they have unfurled.

THE CAUSE OF THE VERNACULARS

(April 21, 1920.)

To anyone who watched the proceedings of the recent Sahitya Sammelams it must be clear that our national awakening is not confined to politics alone. The enthusiasm displayed at these gatherings indicated a happy change. We are giving in thought their proper place to the vernaculars in our national life. Raja Ram Mohan Roy's prophecy that India will one day be an English-speaking country, has to-day many stars in its favour. The great reformer's spirit, however, still haunts some. A number of our eminent men hastily generalise in favour of English as the national medium. The present status of English as a court language weighs with them unduly. They fail to see that the present status of English is no credit to us and that it is not conducive to the growth of a true democratic spirit. That crores of men should learn a foreign tongue for the convenience of a few hundreds of officials is the height of absurdity. An instance is often cited from our past history to prove the necessity of a *lingua franca* to strengthen the Central Government of the country. Nobody disputes the necessity of a common medium. But it cannot be English. The officials have to recognise the vernaculars. The second consideration that appeals to the Anglicists is India's position in the Empire. The argument, put in plain words, amounts to asking 31 crores of Indians to accept English as their common language, for the sake of the other parts of the Empire whose population is not more than 12 crores.

The first fact that ought to receive consideration from

every student of this problem, is that after a century and a half of British Rule, English has failed to take the place of a *lingua franca* of India. A kind of broken English, no doubt, does seem to have succeeded in this respect in our cities. But this fact can only dazzle those who profess to study our national problems, in big cities like Bombay and Calcutta. And what is their population after all? It is only 2·2 per cent. of the total population of India. The second fact that the Anglicists ignore is that a very large majority of our vernaculars are akin to one another, and as a result of this, Hindi as a *lingua franca* suits all the provinces except the Madras Presidency. In view of this advantage in favour of Hindi and in view of our present national consciousness, how can we accept English as our *lingua franca*?

The solution of this problem will decide the fate of the vernaculars. In our educational system, English is suffered to have an unnatural dominance over vernaculars. The extreme Anglicists hold that English should be used as the medium of instruction 'at the earliest age possible.' This argument is based on the fact that children in a foreign country pick up the language of the country without difficulty at an early age. Refuting this argument, the Calcutta University Commission say: "Whereas in a foreign country a child is surrounded by others who speak the language of the country, in a classroom, he is surrounded by others who, with the exception of the teacher, are as ignorant as himself of the new medium; it is a class of one person teaching many, not of many teaching one; and it is only by experiment that classroom methods can be worked out successfully." The

'educational economy,' as an advantage of vernacularising our educational system, has received recognition at the hands of the Commission. We have pointed out, in our issue of Feb. 11*, that the recommendations of the Calcutta University Commission in this connection are a further step. The next logical step after this is recommending the use of vernaculars as the medium in our

* The following is an extract from the article referred to :—

The Government of India have issued a Resolution giving us a forecast of the legislation which they intend to pass on the recommendations of the Sadler Commission Report. We do not propose to enter at present into the consideration whether the measures which the Government propose to take are in consonance with the Commissioners' recommendations. But we hasten to emphasise what we consider the most important suggestion of the Commission, *viz.*, the one regarding the medium of instruction.

What should be the medium of instruction is a century-old question. It has been thrashed out in many Government Despatches and by successive Educational Commissions. . . . Reviewing the whole policy of Government upto August, 1917, the Sadler Report pronounces that during all these 84 years the policy of Government has been 'unswerving' in its double aim of conveying Western education in its higher forms through the medium of English to the Indian peoples, and of encouraging the development of the vernaculars so as to fit them for every use.

We do not propose to dispute to-day the view of the 'Anglicists' of the beginning of the last century. But we do say even in that aim our Government has not succeeded. English was substituted in place of the Oriental tongues, because the Oriental course was too severe to allow of secondary studies. Translations of Western works into Arabic and Sanskrit were not encouraged, because these languages would be unnecessary obstacles for the Indian people to drink at the abundant fountain of Western literature and science. But what do we find to-day? Even leaving aside the masses, the upper and middle classes do not know much of genuine European science. How much we have gained and whether it bears any decent proportion with what it has cost, can be clear to any reader of the condemnations of the Commissions of 1882 and 1902. We are not idly whipping the corpse when we criticise these failures. We are only anxious to point out what would have been the result of the earnest

Universities also. The Sadler Commission have made the matricular stage as a halting place between the use of vernaculars as the medium of instruction in secondary schools and their use in the college department. They have suggested as their own opinion a bilingual system for the future. But they also say: "We do not wish to prejudge the future. It is not for us to predict whether the natural desire to use Bengali to the utmost will eventually outweigh the immense advantages of being able to use a medium common not only to the educated

and consistent attempts to carry out this original policy. A large number of our educated men would have translated the best part of Western works into our own vernaculars, and to-day none could have ventured to stamp our vernaculars as unfit to replace English in our educational system. Moreover, our educated men could not have continued to remain merely intelligent agents waiting at the docks to import whatever the Western brains have shipped out. They could have added their own, they could have certainly created out of their own intelligence a literature and science which would have been more easily and extensively received in the country. These would-have-been apart, what actual progress have we made? If any, does it warrant any hopeful future for us? Can we do anything to shape that future? Will the Reforms give us any help in our work? These are the questions that a practical educationist asks himself. The forward step taken by the Sadler Report indicates our progress—slow, very slow though it may be. The Commission of 1882, as said above, recommended vernacular medium for middle schools and left the question of high schools to the Local Governments' discretion. The Sadler Report recommends vernacular medium for high schools except in the case of English and Mathematics. The Report recommends that English will be the medium of instruction for the two years above the Intermediate stage. Perhaps the gap is left vague purposely. But even without attempting to strain the vagueness in favour of vernacular medium, what we have is a distinctly forward step. We are glad that the superstition about the necessity of the English medium as a means of proficiency in that language and as a means of promotion of European sciences among us, is more exposed by its absurdity.

classes throughout India, but to more peoples than any other, and giving access in effect to the literature and the scientific records of the world." Though, in view of the evidence submitted to them, the Commissioners could not be persuaded to lay down a policy for the future in favour of vernacularising university education also, it is equally true that they could not find anything in the evidence which supported the Anglicists or the Bilinguists. Thus though the replies to the Commissioners' question do not in themselves decide the future, they do "reveal a strong movement in favour of the immediate introduction of Bengali for some university purposes, and of its ultimate introduction for others, a movement of which there was little sign in the debate in the Imperial Legislative Council of 1915."

If we study the Commissioners' analysis of the replies, we can more fully appreciate their remark. The question put to the witnesses was: "Do you hold English should be used as the medium of instruction and examination at every stage above matriculation in the university course?"

The replies are analysed as follows:—

- (i) 129 are positively in the affirmative ;
- (ii) 29 are in the affirmative, with slight reservations ;
- (iii) 68 are in favour of a joint use of English and the vernacular either side by side in the same institution, or in parallel institutions ;
- (iv) 33 replies suggest the gradual replacement of English by the vernacular as the object to be aimed at ;
- (v) 37 are in the negative ; and
- (vi) 9 are insusceptible of classification,

So 155 replies are in favour of the English-medium and nearly 138 are not against using the vernacular medium sooner or later. This proportion is certainly encouraging to the vernacularists. Besides, even among those that favour the English medium there is not an inconsiderable section of witnesses who advise the foreign medium, because there is no provision for proper and sufficient text-books for different subjects. This school of educationists is not against the vernacular medium on principle. They do not like us to get into water till we have learnt swimming. Of a similar sort but more decisive is the evidence of the remaining witnesses that stand for the English medium. This latter evidence has stamped the vernaculars as unfit ever to serve the purpose of the medium of instruction. These witnesses betray an ignorance of the history of our vernaculars. There was a time when Sanskrit was the sole medium for Hindu philosophy.¹ But a few enthusiastic scholars enriched their vernaculars with a decent store of philosophic literature and brought Hindu philosophy within the reach of the masses. Can we not with our present ideas of organisation do for our vernaculars in the sphere of science what once those vernacular scholars did in the sphere of philosophy? As against the diffidence of these witnesses, the vernacularists can cite the example of Japan. The Rev. W. E. S. Holland, Principal of St. Paul's Cathedral College, Calcutta, in his evidence, writes: "Japan, by use of the vernacular, has built up an educational system that commands the respect of the West." The evidence of Babu Ramananda Chatterjee, the editor of the *Modern*

Review, is even more convincing. He says: "The use of the vernaculars in all grades of university education is indispensably necessary. All objections have force only temporarily ; for the most highly developed modern languages and literatures were at first no better than Bengali. In their case development was obtained by use ; and it will be obtained in our case, too, in the same way." Thus we find that though the evidence before Dr. Sadler's Commission is not to-day in favour of vernacularising university education, it does hold high hopes for the future of the cause of the vernacular medium. Time was when the vernacularists' cause was looked upon with distrust. There is now not only no distrust but confidence has taken its place. Two important institutions have recently joined the cause. The Women's University of Poona and the Osmania University of Hyderabad are using the vernaculars as the sole medium. Their progress is being keenly watched by many. Their success will, as Justice Sir Abdur Rahim says, make the solution of the problem of the vernaculars easier. At the last convocation of the Hindu University, the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya invited all the eminent vernacularists to meet in a conference. We hope that such an organised effort will hasten full recognition of the vernaculars as media of instruction.

The present distribution of provinces is another factor which has done no less an injury than any other to the cause of the vernaculars. The redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis will be followed by a rearrangement of universities.

We have shown above the three allied spheres of work

for the cause of vernaculars. And it is evident that unless we advance this cause, we shall not be able to remove the growing intellectual and cultural gulf between our men and women and between the classes and the masses. It is also equally certain that the vernacular medium alone can stimulate originality in thought in the largest number of persons.

A LESSON FROM THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE

(July 28, 1920.)

It had been a rule with England to use her own ships for fetching foreign goods to her shores. Similarly did she use her own vernacular for importing Greek and Latin cultures for her masses. And it was while imbibing these cultures through her vernacular that England developed it. Other European vernaculars also obtained development by similar use. The French language even till the beginning of the 16th century bore marks of its original character as a *lingua rustica*, a tongue suited for homely conversation, for folk-lore and for ballads. The terms of art and science, and the use of sustained eloquence, impassioned poetry or logical discussion were left to Latin as their natural and legitimate exponent.

The first note, however, of the new French literature, in relieving it from the trammels of the Greek and Latin tongues, was sounded by Clement Marot of whom it is told that the persecutions that he had to undergo as a Huguenot, so far from harming, helped his literary faculties. His school became famous for its polished style and graceful wit. The Marotists were soon replaced by

Ronsard and his famous band. This band, called the 'Pleide', aimed at bringing the French language, in vocabulary, construction and application, on a level with the classical tongues by borrowing from the latter. The best of Ronsard's sonnets and odes are such as could not have been previously found in the French language for the simple reason that the medium of expression was wanting. Ronsard and his coterie constructed this medium for themselves. And the reward they received for this labour was that this literary clique was derided for two long centuries. All the branches of literature, dramatic poetry, poetry proper, prose, history, underwent almost equally remarkable changes in this very period.

The superstition of confining theological discussions to Latin was broken in this period by the Protestants. Their teaching, being thus imparted in the French language, could easily reach the masses. Ramus' *Logic* was the first departure from the old habit of composing in Latin all works in any way connected with philosophy. The field of science also was not neglected by the literary genius of this period. The famous potter, Bernard Pallissy, was not less skilful as a fashioner of words than as a fashioner of pots, and his description of the difficulties of his experiments in enamelling, which lasted sixteen years, is classical. Thus the work of elaborating the French language for all the departments of literature was so enthusiastically but hastily carried out in this century that some thrashing was undertaken by Malherbe and his school.

The literary history of France points out that a vernacular of a spirited people not only escapes from the

trammels of a superior tongue but rather comes out of the very struggle more vigorous and more enriched. A similar achievement was made by saints and poets of the 15th century onwards for our vernaculars so that they ceased to be looked upon as outcasts in the treatment of religious and philosophical subjects. In Gujarat it was mainly through the efforts of a devoted band inspired by the famous Premanand that the vernacular was shaped out of what may be called a *lingua rustica*. Thus did our forefathers breathe in the vernaculars the essence of all the knowledge that was within their reach, and bequeath to us a rich and noble trust. Shall we, dazzled by the false prospects of mastering a richer but alien tongue, now betray this trust and allow our vernaculars to lapse into more spoken languages? So long as we do not build our vernaculars to our needs, so long we shall be blindly erecting our temple of learning on shifting sands.

FOREIGNERS IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY

(November 5, 1920.)

There are certain observations in the Justice Sir Abdur Rahim's convocation address, which require to be challenged not on account of their seriousness but on account of the seriousness with which they have been made, and coming as they do from no less a man than Justice Sir Abdur Rahim. Speaking on the necessity of a common language for the whole of India, he said: "It is often asserted that English can never form a proper medium of the highest expression for an Indian. This is however

contrary to patent facts. For instance, could highly abstruse philosophical and entrancingly beautiful poetic thought and emotion be more charmingly expressed than they have been by Rabindranath Tagore in the English language, though some of his writings are called translations?" We venture to answer Justice Sir Abdur Rahim's question in the affirmative, though he expects a negative reply and presents it as a "patent fact." Well, the "patent fact" is that Dr. Rabindranath Tagore gave the best productions of his creative genius, be they philosophical or poetic, first in his own mother tongue, and then gave only a small fraction of them in English—in exquisite English no doubt, but, in many cases, minus the exquisite imagery and untranslatable music of the original. But this question is beside the point. English may be capable of the highest expression. The question is, could we use it as a medium of exchange of our thoughts with the masses? Justice Sir Abdur Rahim's reply to this is amazing: "Thousands of educated Indians all over India use English as the easiest channel of communication." It is amazing, we repeat, that this answer should come from Sir Abdur Rahim who is known to know the "teeming millions" of India. Does he ignore the "teeming millions" in comparison with the "thousands of educated Indians" he knows of? But here comes the most amazing of his statements on the subject. He says: "And is it not also a fact that English, especially in the South, is rapidly gaining ground among sections at least of the labouring classes such as skilled workmen and domestic servants, with advantage to themselves and their employers? In educated families now-a-days most

- 1212121212

children are in fact bilingual." As regards the labouring classes in South India, the present writer knows thousands of labourers who are members of the Madras Labour Union, and many thousands of Negapatam, the greatest labour centre in Madras, who are absolutely innocent of English and on whom English as a channel of communication would be a positive infliction. As regards the bilingual children referred to by Sir Abdur Rahim, we would like to know if they exist outside the few scores of families of the type of Sir Abdur Rahim's. We are loath to have to use the expression, but we cannot help saying that Sir Abdur Rahim is, we are afraid, one of the very few foreigners in their own country.

AN APPEAL TO MADRAS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 21, 1920.)

I use the word Madras here in its popular sense, meaning the people of the whole of the Madras Presidency, speaking all the Dravidian languages.

I observe that Mrs. Besant was disappointed that the proceedings of the Congress were conducted mainly in Hindustani, and she has therefore come to the amazing conclusion that it became a Provincial rather than a National assembly. I entertain a very high regard for Mrs. Besant and her services to India. ✓ No one has popularised the idea of Home Rule for India with so much success as she. The best of us, much younger in age, are able to approach her in her industry, zeal and organis-

ing ability, all devoted to the service of India. She has devoted the best part of her mature life to the service of India and she has deservedly attained to popularity in India, second perhaps only to that of Lokamanya Tilak. But, for the present moment, her views being unacceptable to a large body of educated Indians, she has become somewhat unpopular and it grieves me to have to dissent publicly from her view about Hindustani making the Congress provincial. In my humble opinion it is a grave error of judgment, and duty compels me to draw attention to it. I have attended all the Congress sessions, but one, since 1915. I have studied them specially in order to study the utility of Hindustani compared to English for the conduct of its proceedings. I have spoken to hundreds of delegates and thousands of visitors and I have perhaps covered a larger area and seen a much larger number of people, literate and illiterate, than any public man, not excluding Mrs. Besant and Lokamanya Tilak, and I have come to the deliberate conclusion that no language except Hindustani—a resultant of Hindi and Urdu—can possibly become a national medium for exchange of ideas or for the conduct of national proceedings. It is also my deliberate opinion based upon extensive experience that the nation has very materially suffered by reason of the proceedings of the Congress having been conducted almost entirely in English except during the last two years. I further wish to state as a fact that, barring the Presidency of Madras, everywhere else the majority of the visitors and delegates to the National Congress have always been able to understand more Hindustani than English. The astounding result therefore has been that

the Congress has been national throughout all these long years only as a spectacle but never for its real educative value. In any other country in the world an assembly of this character that has become progressively popular from year to year would have, during thirty-four years of life, given a political education that would have entered every home because the people would have had various questions thrashed out before them in their own language. Whatever therefore the shortcomings of the last Congress, it has certainly been more fully national than any of its predecessors, by reason of the majority of the delegates and visitors having understood the proceedings. If the audience was weary of Mrs. Besant, it was not because it was indifferent or disrespectful to her but because it could not follow her speech, interesting and able though it was. And as national consciousness develops and as the appetite for political knowledge and education grows, as it must, it will become more and more difficult, and rightly so, for a speaker, no matter how able and popular, to command the attention of a popular audience if he spoke in English. I therefore appeal to the people of Madras Presidency to recognise the national necessity for public men to learn Hindustani. Audiences outside Madras can more or less understand Hindustani without difficulty. Dayananda Saraswati enthralled audiences outside Northern India with his Hindustani eloquence and could be understood by even the common people without difficulty. That means that out of a population of three hundred and fifteen millions, only over thirty-eight millions composing the Madras presidency cannot follow a Hindustani

speaker. I have deducted the Mahomedan population for it is common knowledge that the majority of the Mahomedans of Madras Presidency understand Hindustani. The question therefore is: What is the duty of the thirty-eight million inhabitants of that Presidency? Should India for their sake learn English? Or should they for the sake of two hundred and seventy seven million inhabitants of India learn Hindustani? The late Justice Krisnaswami, with his unerring instinct, recognised Hindustani as the only possible medium of expression between the different parts of India. I am not aware that the proposition is seriously challenged by anybody at the present moment. It is not possible for thousands of people to make English their common tongue and it would be highly undesirable, even if it were possible, for the simple reason that the higher and technical knowledge being acquired through English cannot percolate to the masses, as it would if it became current among the upper classes through any of the vernaculars. It is easier, for instance, to translate the writings of Sir J. C. Bose from Bengalee into Gujarati than it is to translate Huxley from English into Gujarati. And what does the proposition that the Madrasis should learn Hindustani for the sake of the rest of India amount to? It simply means that those public workers in Madras who want to work outside India and who want to take part in national assemblies outside the Madras Presidency should devote an hour a day for one year to learning Hindustani. *

*Mr. Gandhi wrote about Dravidians learning the common language as follows in *Young India*, of June 16, 1920 —I have the greatest faith in the Dravidians some day taking up Hindi study seriously. If an eighth of the

Such an effort would enable several thousand Madrasis to pick up sufficient Hindustani to enable them to follow at least the drift of the Congress proceedings at the end of a year's study† They have got in several parts of the

industry that they put in mastering English were to be devoted to learning Hindi, instead of the rest of India remaining a sealed book to them, they will be one with us as never before. I know that some would say the argument cuts both ways. The Dravidians being in a minority, national economy suggests that they should learn the common language of the rest of India than that the rest should learn Tamil, Telugu, Canarese and Malayalam in order to be able to converse with Dravidian India. It is for that reason that Hindi propaganda work of an intense type has been going on in the Madras Presidency for the past eighteen months under the aegis of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan of Allahabad. In response to an appeal by me to the Agraval Marwadi Sammelan held in Bombay last week, the wealthy Marwadis of Bombay and Calcutta present there subscribed on the spot Rs. 50,000 for five years' Hindi propaganda in Madras Presidency. They have once more demonstrated that Hindi work is a speciality of this princely merchant class of India. This generous response increases the responsibility of the Sammelan of Allahabad and of those Dravidians who share with me the belief that Madras must take up Hindi for the sake of full national expansion. Let no Dravidian think that learning Hindi is at all difficult. A little time taken from the recreation hour daily and in a systematic manner will enable an average man to learn Hindi in one year. I would venture to suggest too that large Municipalities might now introduce Hindi as an optional language to be learnt in the municipal schools. I can say from experience that Dravidian children take to Hindi in a remarkably easy manner. Little does any one know that almost all the Tamils and the Telugus living in South Africa can carry on an intelligent conversation in Hindi. I venture to hope, therefore, that the young men of Madras will show their appreciation of Marwadi generosity by availing themselves of the facility afforded to them of learning Hindi without payment.

† Mr. Gandhi again wrote about the use of Hindustani in the Congress in *Young India* of November 10, 1921 as follows:—

Hindustani, *i e.*, the language of the common people, is fast becoming the medium of expression in the All-India Congress Committee. There are members in the Committee who do not understand a word of English, and

presidency Hindi Prachar Offices where Hindustani is taught free of charge to all who wish to learn.

I appeal to Mrs. Besant, who is already devoting *New India* from time to time to the cause of Hindustani learning, to support my appeal.

THE NEED FOR HINDUSTANI

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 2, 1921.)

I have ventured to advise every student to devote this year of our trial to the manufacture of yarn and learning

there are members from the Madras Presidency who do not understand Hindustani. The Bengali members understand Hindustani with difficulty. The latter however appreciate the necessity of Hindustani speech and did not grumble at the proceedings being conducted in Hindustani. It was a real sacrifice for the Dravidians. At the last meeting only one member attended from Madras and not many could come from Malabar. But when all the Dravidians attend, the difficulty becomes serious. And yet there seems to be no way out of it save for the Dravidians to pick up enough Hindustani as early as possible. Those who do not know English cannot be expected to learn English, and the popular assemblies must more and more tend to contain members who do not understand English. Apart therefore from the sentimental and national value of Hindustani, the necessity of all national workers learning Hindustani and the national proceedings being conducted in Hindustani is being increasingly felt. Whilst however this was recognised at the last meeting, the Dravidian and the Bengali members would not listen to a hard and fast rule being adopted by the Committee. They would gladly tolerate Hindustani voluntarily spoken, but will not have it imposed by a resolution of the Committee. The matter was finally referred to the Working Committee. In the face of the divided feeling the Working Committee will find it difficult to bring out a suggestion that will be unanimously accepted by the members.

Hindustani. I am thankful to the Calcutta students that they have taken kindly to the suggestion. Bengal and Madras are the two provinces that are cut off from the rest of India for want of knowledge of Hindustani on their part. Bengal, because of its prejudice against learning any other language of India, and Madras, because of the difficulty of the Dravidians about picking up Hindustani. An average Bengali can really learn Hindustani in two months if he gave it three hours per day and a Dravidian in six months at the same rate. Neither a Bengali nor a Dravidian can hope to achieve the same result with English in the same time. A knowledge of English opens up intercourse only with the comparatively few English knowing Indians, whereas passable knowledge of Hindustani enables us to hold intercourse with the largest number of our countrymen. I do hope the Bengalis and the Dravidians will come to the next Congress with a workable knowledge of Hindustani. Our greatest assembly cannot be a real object lesson to the masses unless it speaks to them in a language which the largest number can understand. I appreciate the difficulty with the Dravidians, but nothing is difficult before their industrious love for the Motherland.

Alongside of my suggestion about Hindustani has been the advice that the students should, during the transition period from inferiority to equality—from foreign domination to Swaraj, from helplessness to self-help—suspend their study of English. If we wish to attain Swaraj before the next Congress, we must believe in the possibility, we must do all that we are capable of doing for its advancement, and one must do nothing

that would not advance it or would actually retard it. Now, adding to our knowledge of English cannot accelerate our progress towards our goal and it can conceivably retard it. The latter calamity is a reality in many cases for there are many who believe that we cannot acquire the spirit of freedom without the music of the English words ringing in our ears and sounding through our lips. This is an infatuation. If it were the truth, Swaraj would be as distant as the Greek Kalends. English is a language of international commerce, it is the language of diplomacy, and it contains many a rich literary treasure, it gives us an introduction to Western thought and culture. For a few of us, therefore, a knowledge of English is necessary. They can carry on the departments of national commerce and international diplomacy, and for giving to the nation the best of Western literature, thought and science. That would be the legitimate use of English. Whereas to-day English has usurped the dearest place in our hearts and dethroned our mother tongues. It is an unnatural place due to our unequal relations with Englishmen. The highest development of the Indian mind must be possible without a knowledge of English. It is doing violence to the manhood and specially the womanhood of India to encourage our boys and girls to think that an entry into the best society is impossible without a knowledge of English. It is too humiliating a thought to be bearable. To get rid of the infatuation for English is one of the essentials of Swaraj.

AN UNMITIGATED EVIL

(April 13, 1921.)

[In reply to a question put to him in a public meeting at Cuttack whether English education was not a mixed evil, inasmuch as Lok, Tilak, Babu Rammohan Rai, and Mr. Gandhi were products of English education, Mr. Gandhi replied as follows —]

This is a representative view being expressed by several people. We must conquer the battle of Swaraj by conquering this sort of wilful ignorance and prejudice of our countrymen and of Englishmen. The system of education is an unmitigated evil. I put my best energy to destroy that system. I don't say that we have got as yet any advantage from the system. The advantages we have so far got, are in spite of the system, not because of the system. Supposing the English were not here, India would have marched with other parts of the world, and even if it continued to be under Moghul rule many people would learn English as a language and a literature. The present system enslaves us, without allowing a discriminating use of English literature. My friend had cited the case of Tilak, Ram Mohan, and myself. Leave aside my case, I am a miserable pigmy.

Tilak and Ram Mohan would have been far greater men if they had not had the contagion of English learning (clapping). I don't want your verbal approval by clapping, but I want the approval of your intellect and reasoning. I am opposed to make a fetish of English education. I don't hate English education. When I want to destroy the Government, I don't want to destroy the English language, but read English as an Indian nationalist would do. Ram Mohan and Tilak (leave aside

my case) were so many pigmies who had no hold upon the people compared with Chaitanya, Shanker, Kabir, and Nanak. Ram Mohan, Tilak were pigmies before these giants. What Shanker alone was able to do, the whole army of English knowing men can't do. I can multiply instances. Was Guru Govind a product of English education ?

Is there a single English knowing Indian who is a match for Nanak, the founder of a sect second to none in point of valour and sacrifice ? Has Rammohan produced a single martyr of the type of Dulip Singh. I highly revere Tilak and Ram Mohan. It is my conviction that if Ram Mohan and Tilak had not received this education but had their natural training, they would have done greater things like Chaitanya. If that race has even to be revived it is to be revived not by English education. I know what treasures I have lost not knowing Hindustani and Sanskrit. I ask you to consider and value the glamour of education at its true worth. English education has emasculated us, constrained our intellect, and the manner of imparting this education has rendered us effeminate. We want to bask in the sunshine of freedom, but the enslaving system emasculates our nation. Pre-British period was not a period of slavery. We had some sort of Swaraj under Moghul rule. In Akbar's time the birth of a Pratap was possible, and in Aurangzeb's time a Sivaji could flourish. Has 150 years of British rule produced any Pratap and Sivaji ?

You have got several Feudatory Native Chiefs, every one of whom bends the knee before the Political Agent and admits his slavery. When I find young men com-

plaining against Native Chiefs, my sympathy goes to them. They are doubly oppressed. When the Native Chiefs do so, I ascribe it to the British conqueror, not to the Chiefs. They are victims to the slave owning system. So my appeal to you all is, "Fly from this monster." Never mind if you beg from door to door. Rather die begging than live in bondage. We must be able to hold the country. Who holds the country now? It is not the English, it is we the Indian people who have accepted bondage. I refuse to shed a single tear if the English retire at this moment. I ask them to help us as our servants, equals, and friends. I shall not allow them to lord it over us with our consent. They may use aeroplanes, army, navy, but not our consent. Realise your own dignity even though India was infested with robbers. You must do your duty. What can be nobler than to die as free men of India? It is a satanic system. I have dedicated my life to destroy the system.

ENGLISH EDUCATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 27, 1921.)

A friend asks me to give my considered view on the value of English education and explain my talk on the sands at Cuttack. I have not read the report of the talk. But I gladly respond to the friend's wish. It is my considered opinion that English education in the manner it has been given has emasculated the English-educated Indian, it has put a severe strain upon the Indian students'

nervous energy, and has made of us imitators. The process of displacing the vernacular has been one of the saddest chapters in the British connection. Rammohan Rai would have been a greater reformer, and Lokmanya Tilak would have been a greater scholar, if they had not to start with the handicap of having to think in English and transmit their thoughts chiefly in English. Their effect on their own people, marvellous as it was, would have been greater if they had been brought up under a less unnatural system. No doubt they both gained from their knowledge of the rich treasures of English literature. But these should have been accessible to them through their own vernaculars. No country can become a nation by producing a race of translators. Think of what would have happened to the English if they had not an authorised version of the Bible. I do believe that Chaitanya, Kabir, Nanak, Guru Govindsing, Sivaji, and Pratap were greater men than Rammohan Rai and Tilak. I know that comparisons are odious. All are equally great in their own. But judged by the results, the effect of Ram Mohan and Tilak on the masses is not so permanent or far reaching as that of the others more fortunately born. Judged by the obstacles they had to surmount, they were giants, and both would have been greater in achieving results, if they had not been handicapped by the system under which they received their training. I refuse to believe that the Raja and the Lokamanya could not have thought the thoughts they did without a knowledge of the English language. Of all the superstitions that affect India, none is so great as that a knowledge of the English language is necessary for imbibing ideas of liberty, and developing

accuracy of thought. It should be remembered that there has been only one system of education before the country for the past fifty years, and only one medium of expression forced on the country. We have, therefore, no data before us as to what we would have been but for the education in the existing schools and colleges. This, however, we do know that India to-day is poorer than fifty years ago, less able to defend herself, and her children have less stamina. I need not be told that that is due to the defect in the system of Government. The system of education is its most defective part.

It was conceived and born in error, for the English rulers honestly believed the indigenous system to be worse than useless. It has been nurtured in sin, for the tendency has been to dwarf the Indian body, mind and soul.

ENGLISH LEARNING

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 1, 1921.*)

Elsewhere the reader will see my humble endeavour in reply to Dr. Tagore's criticism of non-co-operation. * I have since read his letter to the Manager of Shantiniketan. I am sorry to observe that the letter is written in anger and in ignorance of facts. The Poet was naturally incensed to find that certain students in London would not give a hearing to Mr. Pearson, one of the truest of Englishmen, and he became equally incensed to learn that I had told our women to stop English studies. The

* "Poet's Anxiety" see Page 347.

reasons for my advice, the Poet evidently inferred for himself.

How much better it would have been, if he had not imputed the rudeness of the students to non-co-operation, and had remembered that non-co-operators worship Andrews, honour Stokes, and gave a most respectful hearing to Messrs. Wedgwood, Ben Spoor and Holford Knight at Nagpur, that Maulana Mahomed Ali accepted the invitation to tea of an English official when he invited him as a friend, that Hakim Ajmal Khan, a staunch non-co-operator, had the portraits of Lord and Lady Hardinge unveiled in his Tibbi College and had invited his many English friends to witness the ceremony. How much better it would have been, if he had refused to allow the demon doubt to possess him for one moment, as to the real and religious character of the present movement, and had believed that the movement was altering the meaning of old terms, nationalism and patriotism, and extending their scope.

If he, with a poet's imagination, had seen that I was incapable of wishing to cramp the mind of the Indian woman, and I could not object to English learning as such, and recalled the fact that throughout my life I had fought for the fullest liberty for women, he would have been saved the injustice which he has done me, and which I know he would never knowingly do to an avowed enemy. The Poet does not know perhaps that English is to-day studied because of its commercial and so-called political values. Our boys think, and rightly in the present circumstances, that without English they cannot get Government service. Girls are taught English as a passport to

marriage. I know several instances of women wanting to learn English so that they may be able to talk to Englishmen in English. I know husbands who are sorry that their wives cannot talk to them and their friends in English. I know families in which English is being *made* the mother tongue. Hundreds of youths believe that, without a knowledge of English, freedom for India is practically impossible. The canker had so eaten into the society that in many cases the only meaning of education is a knowledge of English. All these are for me signs of our slavery and degradation. It is unbearable to me that the vernaculars should be crushed and starved as they have been. I cannot tolerate the idea of parents writing to their children, or husbands writing to their wives, not in their own vernaculars but in English. I hope I am as great a believer in free air as the great Poet. I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any. I refuse to live in other peoples' houses as an interloper, a beggar or a slave. I refuse to put the unnecessary strain of learning English upon my sisters for the sake of false pride or questionable social advantage. I would have our young men and young women with literary tastes to learn as much of English and other world languages as they like, and then expect them to give the benefits of their learning to India and to the world, like a Bose, a Roy or the Poet himself. But I would not have a single Indian to forget, neglect or be ashamed of his mother tongue, or to feel that he or she cannot think or express the best thoughts in his

or her own vernacular. Mine is not a religion of the prison house. It has room for the least among God's creation. But it is proof against insolence, pride of race, religion or colour. I am extremely sorry for the Poet's misreading of this great movement of reformation, purification and patriotism spelt humanity. If he will be patient, he will find no cause for sorrow or shame for his countrymen. I respectfully warn him against mistaking its excrescences for the movement itself. It is as wrong to judge non-co-operation by the students' misconduct in London or Malegam's in India, as it would be to judge Englishmen by the Dyers or the O'Dwyers.

iv. Swadeshi

SWARAJ IN SWADESHI

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 10, 1919.)

The much talked of Reforms Bill will become the law of the land within a few days and in due course the new legislatures will take the place of the old. . . . But the real reform that India needs is Swadeshi in its true sense. The immediate problem before us is not how to run the government of the country, but how to feed and clothe ourselves. In 1918, we sent sixty crores of rupees out of India for buying cloth. If we continue to purchase foreign cloth at that rate, we deprive the Indian weaver and spinner of that amount from year to year *without practically giving him or her any other work in exchange.*

No wonder a tenth at least of the population is cruelly half-starved and the majority of the rest underfed. He who has eyes may see for himself that *the middle class people are already being underfed and our babies are not getting enough milk for themselves*. The Reform Scheme, no matter how liberal it is, will not help to solve the problem in the immediate future. But Swadeshi can solve it *now*.

The Punjab has made the solution still clearer to me. God be thanked that the beautiful women of the Punjab have not yet lost the cunning of their fingers. High or low, they still know the art of spinning. They have not yet burnt their spinning wheels as many Gujarati women have done. It is to me a perfect delight to find them throwing balls of yarn into my lap. They admit they have time at their disposal for spinning. They admit that the *Khaddar* woven from their hand-spun yarn is superior to the machine-spun yarn. Our forefathers were well able to clothe themselves with little effort and with perfect comfort without having to buy from the foreign markets.

This beautiful art—and yet so simple—is in danger of being lost if we do not wake up betimes. The Punjab gives proof of its possibilities. But the Punjab too is fast losing her hold of it. Every year witnesses a decrease in the output of hand spun yarn. It means greater poverty in our homes and greater idleness. The women who have ceased to spin are not utilizing their time in any other or better manner than gossiping.

But one thing is needful to undo the mischief. If every educated Indian will realise his clear primary duty, he will straightway present the women of his household

with a spinning wheel and provide the facilities for learning the art of spinning. Millions of yards of yarn can be produced from day to day. And if every educated Indian will condescend to wear the cloth produced from such yarn, he will support and assist in rebuilding the only possible cottage industry of India.

Without a cottage industry the Indian peasant is doomed. He cannot maintain himself from the produce of the land. He needs a supplementary industry. Spinning is the easiest, the cheapest and the best.

I know this means a revolution in our mental outlook. And it is because it is a revolution that I claim that the way to Swaraj lies through Swadeshi. A nation that can save sixty crores of rupees per year and distribute that large sum amongst its spinners and weavers in their own homes will have acquired powers of organisation and industry that must enable it to do everything else necessary for its organic growth.

The dreamy reformer whispers, 'Wait till I get responsible government and I will protect India's industry without our women having to spin and our weaver having to weave.' This has been actually said by thinking men. I venture to suggest that there is a double fallacy underlying the proposition. India cannot wait for a protective tariff and protection will not reduce the cost of clothing. Secondly, mere protection will not benefit the starving millions. They can only be helped by being enabled to supplement their earnings by having a spinning industry restored to them. So whether we have a protective tariff or not, we shall still have to revive the hand spinning industry and stimulate hand weaving.

When the war was raging, all available hands in America and England were utilized in the naval yards for building ships and they built them too at an amazing pace. If I would have my way, I would make every available Indian learn spinning or weaving and make him or her do that work for a certain fixed portion of every day. I would start with schools and colleges, presenting as they do ready made organised units.

Multiplication of mills cannot solve the problem. They will take too long to overtake the drain and they *cannot distribute* the sixty crores in our homes. They can only cause concentration of money and labour and thus make confusion worse confounded.

SWADESHI

(April 21, 1920.)

The National week closed on Tuesday the 13th. It was in every way a remarkable demonstration of Hindu-Muslim unity, the determination to secure repeal of the Rowlatt Act and the Satyagrah spirit. The speeches delivered were sober and more to the point than before. There was no disorderliness at any of the meetings of which we have received reports.

What however about Swadeshi? Was Swadeshi too not a product of the Satyagrah spirit and activity? It undoubtedly was. But Swadeshi work is the most constructive of all. It does not lend itself to speeches so much as to solid action. It is not possible to save fifty crores of rupees annually by speeches or demonstrations. It involves much more than the serving of this annual drain. It

involves the honour of Indian womanhood. Everyone who has any connection with the mill industry knows that the women working in the mills are exposed to temptations and risks to which they ought not to be exposed. Many women for want of home employment accept road repair labour. And only those who know what this labour is, understand the risks the women run. Give them the spinning wheel and no woman need ever seek any other employment than sitting at the spinning wheel. Swadeshi means even distribution of wealth from an occupation next in importance only to agriculture. It supplements agriculture and therefore automatically assists materially to solve the problem of our growing poverty. Thus Swadeshi is our veritable Kamadhenu supplying all our wants and solving many of our difficult problems. And an occupation which saves our honour and provides our livelihood, becomes a religious duty.

How can the great consummation be achieved? The answer is simple. Those who realise the importance of the problem must set about working in one or all of the following directions :—

(1) Learn spinning yourself whether man or woman. Charge for the labour if you need money, or make a gift of at least one hour's labour to the nation daily.

(2) Learn weaving yourself whether for recreation or for maintenance.

(3) Make improvements in the present handlooms and the spinning wheels, and if you are rich, pay for them to those who would make them.

(4) Take the Swadeshi vow and patronise the cloth that is both hand spun and hand woven.

(5) Introduce such cloth among your friends and believe that there is more art and humanity in khadi whose yarn has been prepared by your poor sisters.

(6) If you are a mother, you will give a clean and national culture to your children and make them wear clothes made out of beautiful khadi which is available to millions and which can be most easily produced. *

* Mr Gandhi wrote on July 21, 1921, as follows —If you are a *weaver* feeling for the country, the Khilafat and the Punjab —

(1) You should weave only hand-spun yarn, and charge so as to give you living. You should overcome all the difficulties of sizing and adjusting your loom to the requirements of coarse yarn.

(2) If you cannot possibly tackle hand spun yarn for warp, you must use Indian mill spun yarn for it and use hand spun for woof.

(3) Where even the second alternative is not possible, you should use mill spun yarn for both warp and woof.

But you should henceforth cease to use any foreign yarn, whether it is silk or cotton.

If you are a *Congress official or worker*, you should get hold of the weavers within your jurisdiction, and place the foregoing propositions before them for acceptance and help them to the best of your ability.

If you are a *buyer*, insist upon the first class of cloth, but if you have not the sense or the courage to do so, take up the second or the third, but on no account purchase foreign cloth or cloth woven in India but made of foreign yarn.

If you are a *householder*,

(1) You should make a fixed determination henceforth not to buy any foreign cloth.

(2) You should interview the weaver in your neighbourhood, and get him to weave for you enough khadi out of homespun and failing that to weave out of Indian mill spun yarn.

(3) You should deliver to the Congress Committee all your foreign cloth for destruction or sending to Smyrna or elsewhere outside India.

(4) If you have not the courage to give up your foreign cloth, you may wear it out at home for all dirty work, but never go out in foreign cloth.

Swadeshi then means the creation of a most perfect organisation in which every part works in perfect harmony with every other. If we succeed in bringing into being such an organisation, not only is success of Swadeshi assured, but real Swaraj comes to us as a matter of course.

THE USES OF KHADDAR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 28, 1920.)

While the Swadeshi movement is going forward by leaps and bounds and Mahomedans are taking it up as enthusiastically as Hindus, it is well to consider the best method of promoting Swadeshi. The veriest tyro in Swadeshi knows that we do not manufacture enough cloth to supply our wants. If therefore we merely use mill made cloth, we simply deprive the poor of what they need, or at least increase the price of mill made cloth. The only way therefore to encourage Swadeshi is to manufacture more cloth. Mills cannot grow like mushrooms. We must, therefore, fall back upon hand woven and hand spun yarn. Yarn has never perhaps been so dear as it is to-day and mills are making fabulous profits out of yarn. He, therefore, who handspins a yard of yarn, helps its production and cheapens its price.

(5) If you have any leisure, you should devote it to learning the art of spinning even and properly twisted yarn for the sake of the nation.

If you are a *schoolboy or schoolgirl*, you should consider it a sin to receive literary training, before you have spun, carded or woven for the nation for at least four hours per day till the establishment of Swaraj.

How to spin yarn and weave cloth is then the question. I know from personal experience that it is possible to flood the market with hand spun yarn and hand woven cloth if the standard cloth comes to be recognised as fit for wear. This cloth is called Khaddar in Upper India. It is called Khadi in the Bombay Presidency. Thanks to Sarla Devi, she has shown that it is possible to make even Saris out of Khaddar. She thought that she could best express herself during the National Week by wearing Khaddar Sari and Khaddar blouse. And she did it. She attended parties in her Khaddar Sari. Friends thought it was impossible. They thought a woman who had never worn anything but the finest silk or the finest Dacca muslim could not possibly bear the weight of heavy Khaddar. She falsified all fears and was no less active or less elegant in her Khaddar Sari than in her finished silk Saris. "If you do not feel awkward in that Sari of yours, you may go anywhere and to any party and you will find it would be well with you." It was with some such words that her great uncle, Sir Rabindranath Tagore, blessed her when he saw her in her Khaddar Sari. I relate this sacred incident in order to show that two of the most artistic people of India found nothing inartistic in Khaddar. This is the cloth I venture to introduce to the cultured families of India, for, on its use hangs the immediate success of the Swadeshi movement during this its infant stage.

To me Khaddar is any day more artistic than the finest Dacca muslin, for its associations. Khaddar supports to-day those who were starving. It supports women who have been reclaimed from a life of shame or

women who, because they would not go out for work, remained idle and quarrelled among themselves for want of occupations. Khaddar therefore has a soul about it. It has an individuality about it. The wearer is able to trace all the processes of its manufacture to the respective manufacturers. If our tastes were not debased *, we

* A South Indian lawyer sends me the following note .—

" *Khadi* is not as widely used in the Tamil province as in the other provinces, mainly because the women folk do not wear it. The spinning wheel is not much in evidence for the same reason. Plain white cannot be worn by married women here. They can only wear dyed *sadis*. In former times cotton was the only wear of ladies. Now except by the poorest cotton *sadis* are discarded, and silk *sadis* form the daily wear. Silk *sadis* were at first locally manufactured at Koranadu (near Mayavaram) and later on at Conjeevaram and dyed with Indian dyes. They cost from 10 to 30 Rs. They were only occasionally used. Lately the market has been exclusively captured by Bangalore *sadis* dyed with German or English dyes, the least of which costs about 50 Rs. This presses on the poor Brahman householder, specially as he has to clothe the members of his family only with these, and when it is the daily wear, he has to go in for a number of them. On marriage occasions the minimum cost of a *sadi* fit for presentation is above 100 Rs. Many a decent family is ruined by a marriage, mostly on this account. This ruinous habit, which was confined to the Brahmans, has spread among other classes also.

" Besides the question of expense, there is the other aspect of comfort and convenience. Silk is non-absorbing and heavy, and working or cooking in it is martyrdom. It is always hot here except for one or two months of the year. There is also the peculiar insanitary habit of not washing the more costly *sadis* lest they should lose colour and get crumpled. The perspiration and smell emitted are awful.

" Many a householder on the verge of ruin would feel grateful to you if you would bring about a return to economy, simplicity and comfort."

I hope the workers in Madras will deal with the evil complained of in the correspondent's letter, I dread my forthcoming visit to Madras. I share the correspondent's feeling that the Tamil woman is over-fond of her silk *sadi*. There is no more unwholesome garment than silk in a hot climate like that of Madras. And one hundred rupees for a *sadi* is a

would prefer Khaddar to sticky calico even during the summer season. Let those who are now using it certify, if they will, to the truth of my statement. . . .

Khaddar can be used for making underwear, even if one is disinclined to use it for the outer costume. But even if one is not inclined to use it for personal wear, it can be used for making caps, towels, wipers, tea-cloths, satchels, bedsheets, beddings, holdalls, carpet pieces, cushions, covers for furniture, &c. I am having it dyed turkey-red in Swadeshi dye.† It then becomes more durable and looks less dirty when it is used for carpets or mattress making or upholstering.

criminal waste of money in a poor country like India. Men are no better, for they are proud of their handwoven *pugris*, *dhotis* and *uparnas*, little thinking that the yarn used for these things is all foreign. Strange as it may appear, absorbent *Khadi* is cooler than the fine garments which are so prized by men. I am hoping, however, that my faith in the spirituality of Tamilians will be realised even in the difficult matter of Swadeshi, and that they will perceive the spiritual necessity for complete renunciation of foreign cloth and return to the *Charkha*. In the melting plains of Madras and Andhra, I can imagine no industry so helpful as the gentle moving *Charkha*. Dravida land is responsible for sending out the largest number of emigrants to a life of servility and exile. Restoration of the *Charkha* automatically solves the difficult problem of enforced emigration. Land alone cannot support the poor peasantry of India even if there was no assessment to be paid (*Young India*, August 25, 1921.)

† However, *Young India* of May 12, 1920, wrote in the course of a note:—Mr. Gandhi wishes us to add that with reference to the dye, he was misled into believing that it was Swadeshi dye. It has now turned out that even the simple red dye was a foreign thing and not Swadeshi. Effort is now being made to find out cheap and effective Swadeshi compositions.

THE MUSIC OF THE SPINNING WHEEL

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 21, 1920.)

Slowly but surely the music of perhaps the most ancient machine of India is once more permeating society. Pandit Malaviyaji has stated that he is not going to be satisfied until the Ranis and the Maharanis of India spin yarn for the nation, and the Ranas and the Maharanas sit behind the handlooms and weave cloth for the nation. They have the example of Aurangzeb who made his own caps. A greater emperor, Kabir, was himself a weaver and has immortalised the art in his poems. The Queens of Europe, before Europe was caught in Satan's trap, spun yarn and considered it a noble calling. The very words, spinster and wife, prove the ancient dignity of the art of spinning and weaving. 'When Adam delved and Eve span, who then was a gentleman', also reminds one of the same fact. Well may Panditji hope to persuade the royalty of India to the ancient calling of this sacred land of ours. Not on the clatter of arms depends the revival of her prosperity and true independence. It depends most largely upon reintroduction, in every home, of the music of the spinning wheel. It gives sweeter music and is more profitable than the execrable harmonium, concertina and the accordion.

Whilst Panditji is endeavouring in his inimitably suave manner to persuade the Indian royalty to take up the spinning wheel, Shrimati Sarala Devi Choudhurani,

who is herself a member of the Indian nobility, has learnt the art and has thrown herself heart and soul into the movement. From all the accounts received from her and others, Swadeshi has become a passion with her. She says she feels uncomfortable in her muslim saris and is content to wear the khaddar saris even in the hot weather. Her khaddar saris continue to preach true Swadeshi more eloquently than her tongue. She has spoken to audiences in Amritsar, Ludhiana and elsewhere and has succeeded in enlisting the services, for her spinning committee at Amritsar, of Mrs. Ratanchand and Bugga Chowdhry and the famous Ratan Devi who, during the frightful night of the 30th April, despite the curfew order of General Dyer, sat all alone in the midst of the hundreds of the dead and dying, with her dead husband's cold head in her lap. I venture to tender my congratulation to these ladies. May they find solace in the music of the spinning wheel and in the thought that they are doing national work. I hope that the other ladies of Amritsar will help Sarala Devi in her efforts and that the men of Amritsar will realise their own duty in the matter.

In Bombay, ladies of noted families have already taken up spinning. Their ranks have been joined by Mrs. Manekbai Bahadurji who has already learnt the art and who is now trying to introduce it in the Sevasadan. Her Highness the Begum Saheba of Janjira and her sister Mrs. Atia Begum Rahiman have also undertaken to learn the art. I trust that these good ladies will, having learnt spinning, religiously contribute to the nation their daily quota of yarn.

I know that there are friends who laugh at this attempt to revive this great art. They remind me that, in these days of mills, sewing-machines or typewriters, only a lunatic can hope to succeed in reviving the rusticated spinning wheel. These friends forget that the needle has not yet given place to the sewing machine nor has the hand lost its cunning in spite of the typewriter. There is not the slightest reason why the spinning wheel may not coexist with the spinning mill even as the domestic kitchen coexists with the hotels. Indeed typewriters and sewing machines may go, but the needle and the reed pen will survive. The mills may suffer destruction. The spinning wheel is a national necessity. I would ask sceptics to go to the many poor homes where the spinning wheel is again supplementing their slender resources and ask the inmates whether the spinning wheel has not brought joy to their homes.

Thank God, the reward issued by Mr. Rewashanker Jagjiwan bids fair to bear fruit. In a short time, India will possess a renovated spinning wheel—a wonderful invention of a patient Deccan artisan. It is made out of simple materials. There is no great complication about it. It will be cheap and capable of being easily mended. It will give more yarn than the ordinary wheel and is capable of being worked by a five-years old boy or girl. But whether the new machine proves what it claims to be or it does not, I feel convinced that the revival of hand spinning and hand weaving will make the largest contribution to the economic and the moral regeneration of India. The millions must have a simple industry to supplement agriculture. Spinning was the cottage

industry years ago, and if the millions are to be saved from starvation, they must be enabled to reintroduce spinning in their homes and every village must repossess its own weaver.

SWADESHI

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 18, 1920.)

In criticising my article entitled 'The Music of the Spinning Wheel' the *Leader* the other day attributed to me the ideas that I have never entertained. And it is necessary for the purpose of understanding the true value of Swadeshi, to correct some of the current fallacies. The *Leader* considers that I am putting back the hands of the clock of progress by attempting to replace mill made cloth and mill spun yarn by hand woven and hand spun yarn. Now, I am making no such attempt at all. I have no quarrel with the mills. My views are incredibly simple. India requires nearly 13 yards of cloth per head per year. She produces, I believe, less than half the amount. India grows all the cotton she needs. She exports several million bales of cotton to Japan and Lancashire and receives much of it back in manufactured calico although she is capable of producing all the cloth and all the yarn necessary for supplying her wants by hand weaving and hand spinning. India needs to supplement her main occupation, agriculture, with some other employment. Hand spinning is the only such employment for millions. It was the national employment a century ago.

It is not true to say that economic pressure and modern machinery destroyed hand spinning and hand weaving. This great industry was destroyed or almost destroyed by extraordinary and immoral means adopted by the East India Company. This national industry is capable of being revived by exertion and a change in the national taste without damaging the mill industry. Increase of mills is no present remedy for supplying the deficiency. The deficiency can be easily supplied only by hand spinning and hand weaving. If this employment were revived, it would prevent sixty million rupees from being annually drained from the country and distribute the amount among lacs of poor women in their own cottages. I therefore consider Swadeshi as an automatic, though partial, solution of the problem of India's grinding poverty. It also constitutes a ready made insurance policy in times of scarcity of rain.

But two things * are needful to bring about the needed revival—to create a taste for Khaddar and to provide an

* Mr. Gandhi also warned about Khadi imitations thus in *Young India* of July 21, 1921 :—

Mill-made Khadi :—A correspondent draws my attention to the fact that there is now on the market *Khadi* made in our mills and even brought from Japan. I find it difficult to believe this. Has commerce fallen so low that it must intrude upon even sacred soil? Our mills have enough work for their machines without trying to take the bread out of the mouths of the poor workers in their cottages. But let the consumer beware. Hand-spun is unmistakable especially when it is unbleached and unwashed. Let him beware of cloth that looks like mill made and it is yet claimed to be handspun and handwoven. The fact is, that handspun has and ought to have an individuality about it. It must have a peculiar finish to it, and it should never have the dead glossiness of millmade Cloth. Handspun *Khadi* has a roughness that is soothing. The handmade *Khadi* is absorbent, light, pleasant to the touch, and it cannot

organisation for the distribution of carded cotton and collection of yarn against payment.

In one year, by the silent labour of a few men, several thousand rupees have been distributed in Gujarat among several thousand poor women who are glad enough to earn a few pice per day to buy milk for their children etc.

be produced at 4 as a yard without sweating both the weaver and the spinner unless it is manufactured entirely from waste when it is flimsy and wears away after a few washes. And it is best always to buy from stores one knows. The Congress Committees in Bombay and Ahmedabad have taken to certifying stores, where pure *Khadi* can be purchased at reasonable prices. Only that is *Khadi* whose warp and woof are hand-spun and which is handwoven.

Again in August 18, 1921, he wrote —

Fraudulent Imitations—A friend writes from Madras —“The piece of cloth which I enclose herewith is a sample of what is being sold in Madras at from 10 to 15 annas per yard by the Bombay Swadeshi Stores under the name of pure *Khadi*, i.e., handspun and handwoven. How is one to be protected against such frauds? I have little doubt that the sample is of foreign make.”

I have seen the sample and there is not a shadow of a doubt that it is neither handspun nor handwoven. It is possible that it might be a production of Indian mills, though it shows Japanese rather than Indian finish. The pity of it is that such stuff is being sold in Swadeshi stores. But we must be prepared for such frauds. They are an eloquent testimony to the fact that the Swadeshi spirit is rising. How to detect and check these frauds is the question. The golden rule of course is that we must spin our own yarn and get a weaver to weave it under our superintendence. That time is undoubtedly coming. When we cannot spin for ourselves, we must get the spinning done by the thousands of spinners coming into being all over the country. Where we cannot do it, we must in choosing our *Khadi* reject every piece of cloth that looks at all like mill made. For coarser counts it will be most difficult to distinguish between imported cloth and that manufactured by our mills. Handspun *Khadi* lacks the dead polish of the mills but is rougher to look at, porous, light to handle, and pleasant to the touch. It is never glossy. Another safeguard I suggest is that the cloth should be unbleached. The third alternative which is

The argument does not apply to the sugar industry as the *Leader* has attempted. There is not sufficient cane grown in India to supply India's wants. Sugar was never a national and supplementary industry. Foreign sugar has not supplanted Indian sugar. India's wants of sugar have grown and she therefore imports more sugar. But this importation does not institute a drain in the sense in which importation of foreign cloth does. Production of more sugar means more scientific agriculture, more and better machinery for crushing and refining. The sugar industry therefore stands on a different platform. Swadeshi in sugar is desirable, Swadeshi in cloth is an urgent necessity.

KHILAFAT AND SWADESHI

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 25, 1920.)

It was not without much misgiving that I consented to include Swadeshi as a plank in non-co-operation. But Maulana Hasrat Mohani by his sheer earnestness bore me down. I fear however that his reasons for including Swadeshi are different from mine. He is a protagonist of

not free from danger, is that in every Congress district there should be Swadeshi shops licensed by the Congress and there should be expert inspectors who should constantly inspect the stock in licensed shops. If possible, every article should be stamped. I know that we are not organised and trained enough for undertaking this work on a universal scale. But till every district has begun to manufacture all Khadi for itself, some such inspection is undoubtedly necessary, and whatever can be honestly improvised should be done.

boycott of British goods. I cannot reconcile myself to the doctrine as I have explained elsewhere in this issue. But having failed to popularise boycott, Mohani Saheb has accepted Swadeshi as the lesser good. It is however necessary for me to explain how I have come to include Swadeshi in the programme of non-co-operation.

Non-co-operation is nothing but discipline in self-sacrifice. And I believe that a nation that is capable of limitless sacrifice is capable of rising to limitless heights. The purer the sacrifice the quicker the progress. Swadeshi offers every man, woman and child an occasion to make a beginning in self-sacrifice of a pure type. It therefore presents an opportunity for testing our capacity for sacrifice. It is the measure for gauging the depth of national feeling on the Khilafat wrong. Does the nation feel sufficiently to move it to go through even the preliminary process of sacrifice? Will the nation revise its taste for the Japanese silk, the Manchester calico or the French lace and find all its decoration out of hand spun and hand woven cloth *i.e.*, Khadi? If crores of people will refuse to wear or use foreign cloth and be satisfied with the simple cloth that we can produce in our homes, it will be proof of our organising ability, energy, co-operation and self-sacrifice that will enable us to secure all we need. It will be a striking demonstration of national solidarity.

Such a consummation cannot be achieved for the mere wish. It cannot be achieved by one man, no matter how capable and sincere he may be. It cannot be achieved by dotting India with swadeshi stores. It can only be achieved by new production and judicious

distribution. Production means lacs of women spinning in their homes. This requires earnest men to be engaged in honestly distributing carded cotton and collecting yarn and paying for it. It means manufacture of thousands of spinning wheels. It means inducing the hereditary weavers to return to their noble calling and distributing home spun yarn amongst them and setting their manufactures. It is thus only as an energising agent that I can think of Swadeshi as a plank in non-co-operation. But it is not to be despised in that capacity. And I hope that every worker for the cause, even if he can do nothing else, will have done something if he can advance Swadeshi first by increasing production and then distribution. He would be simply moving in a circle if he is satisfied with distributing cloth that is already being manufactured in India.

THE SECRET OF SWARAJ

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 19, 1920.)

The Congress resolution has rightly emphasised the importance of Swadeshi and thereanent of greater sacrifice by merchants.

India cannot be free so long as India voluntarily encourages or tolerates the economic drain which has been going on for the past century and a half. Boycott of foreign goods means no more and no less than boycott of foreign cloth. Foreign cloth constitutes the largest drain voluntarily permitted by us for piece goods. If

India could make successful effort to stop that drain, she can gain Swaraj by that one act.

India was enslaved for satisfying the greed of the foreign cloth manufacturer. When the East India Company came in, we were able to manufacture all the cloth we needed and more for export. By processes that need not be described here, India has become practically wholly dependent upon foreign manufacture for her clothing.

But we ought not to be dependent. India has the ability to manufacture all her cloth if her children will work for it. Fortunately India has yet enough weavers to supplement the out-turn of her mills. The mills do not and cannot immediately manufacture all the cloth we want. The reader may not know that even at the present moment, the weavers weave more cloth than the mills. But the latter weave five crore yards of fine foreign counts, equal to forty crore yards of coarser counts. The way to carry out a successful boycott of foreign cloth is to increase the output of yarn. And this can only be done by hand spinning.

To bring about such a boycott, it is necessary for our merchants to stop all foreign importation, and to sell out, even at a loss, foreign cloth already stocked in India, preferably to foreign buyers. They must cease to speculate in cotton, and keep all the cotton required for home use. They must stop purchasing all foreign cotton.

The mill owners should work their mills not for their profit but as a national trust and therefore cease to spin finer counts, and weave only for the home market.

The householder has to revise his or her ideas of fashion and at least for the time being, suspend the use of fine

garments which are not always worn to cover the body. He should train himself to see art and beauty in the spotlessly white *khaddar* and to appreciate its soft unevenness. The householder must learn to use cloth as a miser uses his horde.

And even when the householders have revised their tastes about dress, somebody will have to spin yarn for the weavers. This can only be done by every one spinning during spare hours either for love or money.

We are engaged in a spiritual war. We are not living in normal times. Normal activities are always suspended in abnormal times. And if we are out to gain *Swaraj* in a year's time, it means that we must concentrate upon our goal to the exclusion of every thing else. I therefore venture to suggest to the students all over India to suspend their normal studies for one year and devote their time to the manufacture of yarn by hand spinning. It will be their greatest act of service to the motherland, and their most natural contribution to the attainment of *Swaraj*. During the late war our rulers attempted to turn every factory into an arsenal for turning out bullets of lead. During this war of ours, I suggest every national school and college being turned into a factory for preparing cones of yarns for the nation. The students will lose nothing by the occupation ; they will gain a kingdom here and hereafter. There is a famine of cloth in India. To assist in removing this dearth is surely an act of merit. If it is sinful to use foreign yarn, it is a virtue to manufacture more Swadeshi yarn in order to enable us to cope with the want that would be created by the disuse of foreign yarn.

The obvious question asked would be : if it is so

necessary to manufacture yarn, why not pay every poor person to do so? The answer is that hand spinning is not, and never was, a calling like weaving, carpentry, etc. Under the pre-British economy of India, spinning was an honourable and leisurely occupation for the women of India. It is difficult to revive the art among the women in the time at our disposal. But it is incredibly simple and easy for the school-goers to respond to the nation's call. Let no one decry the work as being derogatory to the dignity of man or students. It was an art confined to the women of India because the latter had more leisure. And being graceful, musical, and as it did not involve any great exertion, it had become the monopoly of women. But it is certainly as graceful for either sex as is music for instance. In hand spinning is hidden the protection of women's virtue, the insurance against famine, and the cheapening of prices. In it is hidden the secret of *Swaraj*. The revival of hand spinning is the least penance we must do for the sin of our forefathers in having succumbed to the satanic influences of the foreign manufacturer.

The school-goers will restore hand spinning to its respectable status. They will hasten the process of making *Khaddar* fashionable. For no mother or father worth the name will refuse to wear cloth made out of yarn spun by their children. And the scholars' practical recognition of art will compel the attention of the weavers of India. If we are to wean the Punjabi from the calling not of a soldier but of the murderer of innocent and free people of other lands, we must give back to him the occupation of weaving. The race of the peaceful Julahis

of the Punjab is all but extinct. It is for the scholars of the Punjab to make it possible for the Punjabi weaver to return to his innocent calling.

I hope to show in a future issue how easy it is to introduce this change in the schools and how quickly, on these terms, we can nationalise our schools and colleges. Everywhere the students have asked me what new things I would introduce into our nationalised schools. I have invariably told them I would certainly introduce spinning. I feel so much more clearly than ever before that during the transition period, we must devote exclusive attention to spinning and certain other things of immediate national use, so as to make up for past neglect. And the students will be better able and equipped to enter upon the new course of studies.

Do I want to put back the hand of the clock of progress? Do I want to replace the mills by hand spinning and hand weaving? Do I want to replace the railway by the country cart? Do I want to destroy machinery altogether? These questions have been asked by some journalists and public men. My answer is: I would not weep over the disappearance of machinery or consider it a calamity. But I have no design upon machinery as such. What I want to do at the present moment is to supplement the production of yarn and cloth through our mills, save the millions we send out of India, and distribute them in our cottages. This I cannot do unless and until the nation is prepared to devote its leisure hours to hand spinning. To that end we must adopt the methods. I have ventured to suggest for popularising spinning as a duty rather than as a means of livelihood.

THE DUTY OF SPINNING

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 2, 1921.)

In "The Secret of Swaraj" * I have endeavoured to show what home spinning means for our country. In any curriculum of the future, spinning must be a compulsory subject. Just as we cannot live without breathing and without eating, so is it impossible for us to attain economic independence and banish pauperism from this ancient land without reviving home spinning. I hold the spinning wheel to be as much a necessity in every household as the hearth. No other scheme that can be devised will ever solve the problem of the deepening poverty of the people.

How then can spinning be introduced in every home? I have already suggested the introduction of spinning and systematic production of yarn in every national school. Once our boys and girls have learnt the art they can easily carry it to their homes.

But this requires organisation. A spinning wheel must be worked for twelve hours per day. A practised spinner can spin two tolas and a half per hour. The price that is being paid at present is on an average four annas per forty tolas or one pound of yarn *i. e.*, our pice per hour. Each wheel therefore should give three annas per day. A strong one costs seven rupees. Working, therefore, at the rate of twelve hours per day it can pay for itself in less than 38 days. I have given enough figures to work

* See page 502.

upon. Anyone working at them will find the results to be startling.

If every shool introduced spinning, it would revolutionise our ideas of financing education. We can work a school for six hours per day and give free education to the pupils. Supposing a boy works at the wheel for four hours daily, he will produce every day 10 tolas of yarn and thus earn for his school one anna per day. Suppose further that he manufactures very little during the first month, and that the school works only twenty-six days in the month. He can earn after the first month Rs. 1-10 per month. A class of thirty boys would yield, after the first month, an income of Rs. 48-12 per month.

I have said nothing about literary training. It can be given during the two hours out of the six. It is easy to see that every school can be made self-supporting without much effort and the nation can engage experienced teachers for its schools.

The chief difficulty in working out the scheme is the spinning wheel. We require thousands of wheels if the art becomes popular. Fortunately, every village carpenter can easily construct the machine. It is a serious mistake to order them from the Ashram or any other place. The beauty of spinning is that it is incredibly simple, easily learnt, and can be cheaply introduced in every village.

The course suggested by me is intended only for this year of purification and probation. When normal times are reached and Swaraj is established, one hour only may be given to spinning and the rest to literary training.

THE POTENCY OF THE SPINNING WHEEL

(July 6, 1921.)

No amount of human ingenuity can manage to distribute water over the whole land, as a shower of rain can. No irrigation department, no rules of precedence, no inspection and no water-cess. Every thing is done with an ease and a gentleness that by their very perfection evade notice. The spinning wheel, too, has got the same power of distributing work and wealth in millions of houses in the simplest way imaginable. Those of us who do not know what it is to earn a livelihood by the sweat of one's brow, may consider the three annas a day as a pittance beneath the consideration of any man. They do not know that, even in these days of high prices, there are districts in India where even three annas a day would be a boon to the poor.* But we must not consider the question of the spinning wheel merely from the point of individual

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of August 4, 1921 :—No one has ever said that spinning can be a means of livelihood except to the very poor. It is intended to restore spinning to its ancient position as a universal industry auxiliary to agriculture and resorted to by agriculturists during those months of the year when agricultural operations are suspended as a matter of course and cultivators have otherwise little to do. For the present all people alike are invited to devote their leisure to spinning, with a view to bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth in course of the present year. No one asks an able bodied labourer who can earn twelve annas a day to give up his work in order to take to spinning. However, people are so poor in many parts of the country that a daily wage of even 3 annas a day would be a veritable boon to them and enable them to tide over bad seasons. The spinning wheel is capable of being applied as a complete insurance against famines and droughts. 3 annas again is only a most cautious and conservative estimate. . . . The daily wage might easily be 4 or 5 annas.

earnings. The spinning wheel is a force in national regeneration. If we wish for real Swaraj, we must achieve economic independence. Boycott of foreign cloth is its negative aspect. For this we must produce cloth sufficient to clothe the country. This can only be done by hand spinning. All the mills that we have got will not be able together to cope with the situation. If all rush for the thin mill made cloth, it will rise in price beyond the capacity of the poor, and the experience of 1907-08 will be repeated.

Moreover, the cloth best suited for the three seasons of India is *Khadi*. Those who have used *Khadi* during this summer, have come to realise that, after the soft clean touch of *Khadi*, it is impossible to use sticky Malmal or twills. *Khadi* can enable its wearer to withstand the cold of an average winter as even wool cannot. The climate of India demands that clothes be washed as often as possible. Only *Khadi* can stand this constant wash. *Khadi* was once the dress of the nation at large. One must see to believe how venerable the old Patels and Deshmukhs looked when dressed in home spun *Khadi*. There are instances of whole villages taking a legitimate pride in the fact that they had to import nothing but salt in the whole round of the six seasons. With such conditions, there could be no drain, no exploitation and therefore no Para-raj (Other's Rule). A little village could make terms with the rulers of the land consistent with its self-respect, dignity and independence. Is our love of luxury so inveterate that we cannot control it even for the sake of Swaraj ?

HAND SPINNING AGAIN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 16, 1921.)

The *Servant of India* has a fling too at spinning and that is based, as I shall presently show, on ignorance of the facts. Spinning does protect a woman's virtue, because it enables women, who are to day working on public roads and are often in danger of having their modesty outraged, to protect themselves, and I know no other occupation that lacs of women can follow save spinning. Let me inform the jesting writer that several women have already returned to the sanctity of their homes and taken to spinning which they say is the one occupation which means so much *barkat* (blessing). I claim for it the properties of a musical instrument, for whilst a hungry and a naked woman will refuse to dance to the accompaniment of a piano, I have seen women beaming with joy to see the spinning wheel work, for they know that they can through that rustic instrument both feed and clothe themselves.

Yes, it does solve the problem of India's chronic poverty and is an insurance against famine. The writer of the jests may not know the scandals that I know about irrigation and relief works. These works are largely a fraud. But if my wise counsellors will devote themselves to introducing the wheel in every home, I promise that the wheel will be an almost complete protection against famine. It is idle to cite Austria. I admit the poverty and limitations of my humanity. I can only think of

India's *Kamadhenu*, and the spinning wheel is that for India. For India had the spinning wheel in every home before the advent of the East India Company. India being a cotton growing country, it must be considered a crime to import a single yard of yarn from outside. The figures quoted by the writer are irrelevant.

The fact is that in spite of the manufacture of 62·7 crores pounds of yarn in 1917-18, India imported several crore yards of foreign yarn which were woven by the mills as well as the weavers. The writer does not also seem to know that more cloth is to-day woven by our weavers than by mills, but the bulk of it is foreign yarn and therefore our weavers are supporting foreign spinners. I would not mind it much if we were doing something else instead. When spinning was almost compulsorily stopped nothing replaced it save slavery and idleness. Our mills cannot to-day spin enough for our wants, and if they did, they will not keep down prices unless they were compelled. They are frankly money makers and will not therefore regulate prices according to the needs of the nations. Hand spinning is therefore designed to put millions of rupees in the hands of poor villagers. Every agricultural country requires a supplementary industry to enable the peasants to utilise the spare hours. Such industry for India has always been spinning. It is such a visionary ideal—an attempt to revive an ancient occupation whose destruction has brought on slavery, pauperism and disappearance of the inimitable artistic talents which was once all expressed in the wonderful fabric of India and which was the envy of the world.

And now a few figures: One boy could, if he worked,

say, four hours daily, spin $\frac{1}{4}$ lb. of yarn. 64,000 students would, therefore, spin 16,000 lbs. per day and therefore feed 8,000 weavers if a weaver wove two lbs. of hand spun yarn. But the students and others are required to spin during this year of purification by way of penance in order to popularise spinning and to add to the manufacture of hand spun yarn so as to overtake full manufacture during the current year. The nation may be too lazy to do it. But if all put their hands to this work, it is incredibly easy, it involves very little sacrifice and saves an annual drain of sixty crores even if it does nothing else. I have discussed the matter with many mill-owners, several economists, men of business, and no one has been able to challenge the position herein set forth. I do expect the *Servant of India* to treat a serious subject with seriousness and accuracy of information.

FAMINE INSURANCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 16, 1921.)

When I wrote about the spinning wheel being a household instrument of famine insurance, I little realised its implications. What I then saw through the glass of reason darkly, I now see more clearly with the undimmed eye of experience. With famine staring us in the face in Bijapur, Ahmednagar and in some parts of Gujarat, it behoves us to consider carefully what this spinning wheel as an insurance agency means.

Let me give some figures. A spinning wheel costs, say,

six rupees. If we supply a family of three with two wheels and all the members work at it together for eight hours each, they will, between them, earn at least six annas per day. I claim that six annas per day for a family will keep it going during a season of distress. I can conceive it to be possible for them to work at the rate of twelve hours each, when the work has to be done in their homes at their own leisure. They add fifty per cent. to the daily earning making it nine annas per day. Thus, at an outlay of Rs. 12,000, we can support for four months one thousand families, or three thousand souls, and get from them a return of

$$\frac{1000 \text{ families} \times 6 \text{ annas} \times 120 \text{ days}}{16} = \text{Rs. 45,000}$$

worth of labour. No doubt, forty-five thousand rupees will have to be found in the first instance for organising famine relief, in addition to carded cotton and the spinning wheels. The whole of the yarn that may be produced by the famine-stricken people would be used by the nation. There will be some little waste during the first month of learning. I use the adjectives 'some little' advisedly because cotton will not be absolutely wasted.

Suppose further that we make a present to these families of the spinning wheels, they will never need to starve or be in need of funds. All that will be necessary for these families in future will be to be able to have a supply of cotton and a ready sale for the yarn they may manufacture. The experiment can be indefinitely multiplied, and I make bold to say that, if we introduce the spinning wheel in every family home, we insure the nation practically against famine. I have assumed here that the

famine is one of money and that the distressed area is able to buy corn if it has funds. Such was the case in Kheda three years ago, such was the case in Orissa last year, and such is the case in Bijapur and Gujarat this year. I invite the public to try the experiment. I would ask the benevolent not to waste their benevolence by contributing funds to Government organisations which make people more and more helpless. I advise them to form their own committees of trustworthy workers and try the experiment themselves. Surely they will see that in it there is no possibility of failure or loss and every probability of the families helped becoming self-reliant and not feeling that they were living on public charity.

Let no one labour under the delusion that the spinning wheel is a toy of the moment. Thousands of wheels have been already made and are working. Several thousand rupees are every month being distributed in poor homes. A few more months of honest and intelligent toil, and the spinning wheel will have taken firm root.

HAND SPINNING AND HAND WEAVING

(September 15, 1920.)

Some people spurn the idea of making, in this age of mechanism, hand spinning and hand weaving a national industry, but they forget there are millions of their countrymen in this age who for want of suitable occupation are eking out a most miserable existence, and thousands who die of starvation and under-feeding every year, whereas only a hundred years ago hand spinning

and hand weaving proved an insurance against a pauper's death. The extent to which relief was provided by this industry is recorded by Mr. Dutt in "History of India : Victorian Age" from the investigations conducted by Dr. Buchanan for seven years, 1813-1820. Dr. Buchanan travelled throughout the whole country. And his observations and statistics convinced him that next to agriculture hand spinning and hand weaving were the great national industries. We make no apology for giving some of the facts and figures collected by Dr. Buchanan.

In the districts of Patna and Behar with a population of 3,364,420 souls, the number of spinners was 330,426. "By far the greater part of these," observed Dr. Buchanan, "spin only a few hours in the afternoon, and upon the average estimate the whole value of the thread that each spins in a year is worth Rs. 7-2-8 giving a total annual income of Rs. 2,367,277 and by a similar calculation the raw material at the retail price will amount to Rs. 1,286,272, leaving a profit of Rs. 1,081,005 for the spinners or Rs. 3-4-0 per spinner."

In the district of Shahbad, spinning was the chief industry. 159,500 women were employed in spinning and spun yarn to the value of Rs. 1,250,000 a year. Deducting the value of cotton each woman had some thing left to her to add to the income of the family to which she belonged.

In the Bhagalpur district (with a population of 2,019,900) where all castes were permitted to spin, 160,000 women spent a part of their time in spinning and each made an annual income of Rs. 4½ after deducting the cost of cotton. This was added to the family income.

In the Gorakhpur district (population 1,385,495) 175,600 women found employment in spinning and made an annual income of Rs. $2\frac{1}{2}$ per head. In the Dinjapur district (with a population of 300,000) cotton spinning which was the principal manufacture, occupied the leisure hours 'of all women of higher rank and of the greater part of the farmers' wives.' Three rupees was the annual income each woman made by spinning in her afternoon hours.

In the Purniya district, (population 2,904,380) all castes considered spinning honourable and a very large population of women of the district did some spinning in their leisure hours.

In eastern Mysore women of all castes except Brahmans bought cotton and wool at weekly markets, spun at home, and sold the thread to weavers. Men and women thus found a profitable occupation. In Coimbatore, the wives of all the low class cultivators were great spinners.

The statistics of weavers show that they also were as numerous as the spinners. In the Patna city and Behar district, the total number of looms employed in the manufacture of chaddars and table cloth was 750, and the value of the annual manufactures was Rs. 5,40,000, leaving a profit of Rs. 81,400, deducting the value of thread. This gave a profit of Rs. 108 for each loom worked by three persons or an income of Rs. 36 a year for each person. But the greater part of the cloth weavers made coarse cloth for country use to the value of Rs. 24,38,621 after deducting the cost of thread. This gave a profit of Rs. 28 for each loom.

In Shahabad weavers worked in cotton only. 7,025 houses of weavers worked in cotton and had 7,950 looms. Each loom made an annual income of Rs. 20 $\frac{3}{4}$ a year and each loom required the labour of a man and his wife as well as one boy or girl. But as a family could not be supported for less than Rs. 48 a year, Dr. Buchanan suspected that the income of each loom given above was understated.

In the Bhagalpur district some worked in silk alone. A great many near the town made Jasar fabrics of silk and cotton intermixed; 3,275 looms were so employed that the annual profit of each weaver employed in the mixed silk and cotton industry was calculated to be Rs. 46 besides what the woman made.

For the weaving of cotton cloth, there were 7,279 looms. Each loom yielded a profit of Rs. 20 a year. But by another calculation, Dr. Buchanan estimated it to be Rs. 32 a year.

In the Gorakhpur district there were 5,434 families of weavers possessing 6,174 looms and each loom brought an income of Rs. 23 $\frac{1}{2}$. Dr. Buchanan thought this was too low an estimate and believed that each loom brought an income of Rs. 88 in the year.

In the Dungarpur district "Maldai" cloth was manufactured. It consisted of silk warp and cotton woof. 4,000 looms were employed in this work and it was said that each loom made 20 Rs. worth of cloth in a month, which Dr. Buchanan considered too high an estimate. About 800 looms were employed in making larger pieces in the form of Elachis.

In the Purniya district weavers were numerous...In

Eastern Mysore cotton weavers made cloth for home use as silk weavers produced a strong rich fabric. Workmen who made cloth with silk borders earned 6 as. a day and those who made silk cloth earned 4 as.

Thus we see that crores of rupees were earned by these spinners and weavers by following their noble and honest calling. The decentralisation of the industry—every village, town and district having always at its command as much supply as it needed—automatically facilitated its distribution and saved the consumer from Railway, Excise, and all sorts of tariffs and middlemen's profits that he is a victim to to-day. If we cannot return to these days—though there is no reason except our own bias and doubt why we should not—can we not at least so organise our industries as to do away without much delay with the foreign cloth with which our markets are being dumped to-day?

FAMINE RELIEF

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 6, 1921.)

The visit to the Ceded Districts brought abundant proof of spinning wheel being the greatest insurance against famine, and being also the best measure of relief. There is a severe famine raging in some parts of these districts. One of the workers told me that a woman not being able to support herself and her children had drowned herself and her children. It is not possible to give doles of charity to hundreds of thousands of

men. And men who live on charity lose all sense of self-respect. It is not as if there is no corn to be had in the affected area. People have no work and no money. The Government's relief work consists in breaking and carrying stones. A friend remarked that the Government had roads torn down and repaired in order to find work for the men and women in distress. Whether roads are torn down or not, road repair is the only relief work the Government provides. I understood that the actual wage that found its way into a woman's hands was an anna or five pice, and not more than ten pice into a man's hands. I saw, on the other hand, that a Congress Committee was paying three annas per day to Panchama women working at the spinning wheel for eight hours a day. And what is being done for the Panchama women can be done for thousands of famine stricken women and, for that matter, men. In these districts 3 annas a day, even for men, is a veritable boon. But the spinning wheel has possibilities which no other occupation has. For it involves the preliminary processes of ginning and carding and the subsequent process of weaving. In the Ceded Districts it is possible without much difficulty to teach weaving. And if the whole of cloth manufacture can be organised, thousands of men can find permanent occupation in their own homes. Every worker freely acknowledged that both the workers and the afflicted people had begun to realise the possibilities of the spinning wheel, and already the people were filled with hope and the workers had commenced organising spinning and weaving everywhere. I met people who told me they used to laugh at my statement that the spinning wheel

was the best famine insurance, but practical experience convinced them of the truth of it.

I know that this is but the commencement of the transformation. But when it is complete, not a man or woman having sound hands need beg or starve. To-day we have the humiliating and debasing spectacle in a famine year of thousands, though well able to work, living on charity and semi-starvation for want of useful work.

Therefore I suggest to every Congress and Khilafat worker the advisability of organising hand spinning and hand weaving in his respective district to the exclusion of every other activity. We should be ashamed of resting or having a square meal so long as there is one able bodied man or woman without work or food. I would urge monied man against giving indiscriminate charity or free meals. We shall be cursed by the future generation, if we divide India into givers and receivers of alms. If we want the nation to have any self-respect at all, we must provide against the recurring scarcity. Let those, therefore, who wish to feed the poor, find spinning wheels for them and provide facilities for learning the various processes.

GREATER USE OF HAND LOOMS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 11, 1921.)

To the Editor, *Young India*.

Sir,

All patriotic Indians agree that India should be a self-clothing country, that is, that India should not import foreign yarn or piece-goods. The question is as to the best and the quickest means of attaining that object.

The Charkha has been preached to be the means. We, however, believe that there are easier, quicker, and in every respect better, means for accomplishing the object. What are they? Let us declare at once that they are —(1) increasing the number of hand looms in India, (2) preaching that it is the imperative duty of every Indian to be satisfied for the present with comparatively coarse cloth made from yarn produced in India and to avoid using imported cloth, and cloth made in India from imported yarn (chiefly fine), however comfortable wearing these clothes may be. A little explanation is necessary. One of the cardinal facts to remember in this connection is that if the total amount of twist and yarn, that is now produced in India without the use of Charkha, were converted into cloth, it would practically suffice to clothe India from her own produce, supposing the country were prepared to wear coarse cloth only. As a matter of fact about 143 million pounds of twist and yarn made in India are *exported* every year from India. Convert, *i.e.*, weave this stuff into cloth in India and prepare the country for making the small sacrifice involved in being content for the present with the coarse cloth thus produced, and the great problem of making India self-clothing within a very short time is solved. Here the first question that crosses one's mind is whether the existing power looms and hand looms of India would be able to weave the above huge quantity of yarn into cloth. The answer must be in the negative. What then is to be done? The obvious answer is : increase the number of looms. It would be difficult to increase the number of power looms at once. A large quantity of machinery (weaving) would have to be imported from foreign lands. That means a delay of two or three years, leaving aside for the nonce the difficulties arising from the unfavourable rate of exchange and the recently imposed high import duty on this kind of machinery. To increase the number of *hand* looms is not difficult. They can be manufactured here in India within a very short time and at a very small cost. From a calculation based on statistics for the year 1919 published by the Director-General of Statistics, which however I do not wish to inflict on your readers, it can be easily shown that it would be practically sufficient for our present purposes, if we multiply our hand looms to twice their existing number. And I appeal to the readers to consider the matter with all the earnest care that the importance of the question demands, and put their powerful shoulders to the wheel.

CALCUTTA.

19th April.

Yours faithfully,

S. B. MITRA.

The correspondent seems to ignore the fact that the

propaganda of hand spinning involves that of hand weaving. India cannot be self-contained for her clothing if the hand spun yarn could not be hand woven. But the mere multiplying of hand looms cannot solve the problem. The art of hand weaving is not dead. There are to day more hand looms working in India than power looms. But they mostly weave foreign yarn. I heartily support the proposition that we should use only coarse cloth and induce the weavers to weave only Indian yarn. The correspondent should also have advised 'the leaders' to appeal to the mill owners not to export yarn at all. Only it is well nigh impossible to induce the mill owners to forego the larger profits they make by exporting yarn. If only the mill owners and the other capitalists took it into their heads, they could certainly bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth during the year. But even so the problem of hand spinning remains. It is not enough merely to bring about boycott of foreign cloth. It is absolutely necessary to give the millions of the peasantry a supplementary industry. They must utilize, as they did before, their spare hours in some occupation supplementary to agriculture. The millions who are living in semi-starvation for want of occupation, must find an easy one in their own homes. This is again hand spinning. What the correspondent urges is going on. The number of hand looms is increasing, the people are taking to wearing coarse cloth. But universal hand spinning alone can immediately solve the problem of the growing poverty of the masses. Let me put my conviction still more strongly. India cannot become a contented, fearless, and self-supporting India without hand spinning.

THE MESSAGE OF THE CHARKHA

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 29, 1921.)

The *Indian Social Reformer* has published a note from a correspondent in praise of the spinning wheel. The correspondent in the course of his remarks hopes that the movement will be so organised that the spinners may not weary of it. Mr. Amritlal Thakkar in his valuable note (published in the *Servant of India*) on the experiment which he is conducting in Kathiawad, says that the charkha has been taken up by the peasant women. They are not likely to weary, for to them it is a source of livelihood to which they were used before. It had dried up, because there was no demand for their yarn. Town people who have taken to spinning may weary, if they have done so as a craze or a fashion. Those only will be faithful who consider it their duty to devote their spare hours to doing what is to-day the most useful work for the country. The third class of spinners are the school-going children. I expect the greatest results from the experiment of introducing the charkha in the National Schools. If it is conducted on scientific lines by teachers who believe in the charkha as the most efficient means of making education available to the seven and a half lacs of villages in India, there is not only no danger of weariness, but every prospect of the nation being able to solve the problem of financing mass education without any extra taxation and without having to fall back upon immoral sources of revenue.

The writer in the *Indian Social Reformer* suggests that an attempt should be made to produce finer counts on the spinning wheel. I may assure him that the process has already begun, but it will be some time before we arrive at the finish of the Dacca muslin or even twenty counts. Seeing that hand-spinning was only revived last September, and India began to believe in it somewhat only in December, the progress it has made may be regarded as phenomenal.

The writer's complaint that hand spun yarn is not being woven as fast as it is spun, is partly true. But the remedy is not so much to increase the number of looms, as to persuade the existing weavers to use hand spun yarn. Weaving is a much more complex process than spinning. It is not, like spinning, only a supplementary industry, but a complete means of livelihood. It therefore never died out. There are *enough weavers and enough looms in India to replace the whole of the foreign import of cloth*. It should be understood that our looms—thousands of them in Madras, Maharashtra and Bengal—are engaged in weaving the fine yarn imported from Japan and Manchester. We *must* utilize these for weaving hand spun yarn. And for that purpose, the nation has to revise its taste for the thin, tawdry and useless muslins. I see no art in weaving muslins that do not cover but only expose the body. Our ideas of art must undergo a change. But even if the universal weaving of thin fabric be considered desirable in normal conditions, at the present moment whilst we are making a mighty effort to become free and self supporting, we must be content to wear the cloth that our hand spun yarn may

yield. We have therefore to ask the fashionable on the one hand to be satisfied with coarser garments ; we must educate the spinners on the other hand to spin finer and more even yarn.

The writer pleads for a reduction in the prices charged by mill owners for their manufactures- When lovers of Swadeshi begin to consider it their duty to wear Khaddar, when the required number of spinning wheels are working and the weavers are weaving hand spun yarn, the mill owners will be bound to reduce prices. It seems almost hopeless merely to appeal to the patriotism of those whose chief aim is to increase their own profits.

Incongruities pointed out by the writer such as the wearing of Khaddar on public occasions and at other times of the most fashionable English suits, and the smoking of most expensive cigars by wearers of Khaddar, must disappear in course of time, as the new fashion gains strength. It is my claim that as soon as we have completed the boycott of foreign cloth, we shall have evolved so far that we shall necessarily give up the present absurdities and remodel national life in keeping with the ideal of simplicity and domesticity implanted in the bosom of the masses. We will not then be dragged into an imperialism, which is built upon exploitation of the weaker races of the earth, and the acceptance of a giddy materialistic civilization protected by naval and air forces that have made peaceful living almost impossible. On the contrary, we shall then refine that imperialism into a commonwealth of nations which will combine, if they do, for the purpose of giving their best to the world and of protecting, not by brute force

but by self-suffering, the weaker nations or races of the earth. Non-co-operation aims at nothing less than this revolution in the thought-world. Such a transformation can come only after the complete success of the spinning wheel. India can become fit for delivering such a message, when she has become proof against temptation and therefore attacks from outside, by becoming self-contained regarding two of her chief needs—food and clothing.

A CONFESSION OF ERROR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 18, 1921.)

God only knows how often I have erred. Those who charge me with infallibility simply do not know me. My own experiences have taught me to be humble enough to know and to appreciate the fact that life consists in struggling against errors. When I launched out light-heartedly on civil disobedience in 1919, I saw that I erred grievously. As soon as I perceived at Nadiad the want of foresight, I called it a Himalayan miscalculation. It was not an exaggeration. And if India has not lost in moral growth thereby, it is because I had the wisdom to make a clean and full confession. I wish similarly to make another confession during these few weeks of concentrated Swadeshi work. I have already made the confession in my talks with students and professors. But a more definite and more public confession is necessary as well for my mental peace as for the present propaganda.

All these nine months' experience has confirmed the correctness of the boycott of government educational institutions. But I was weak about the alternative suggested, and I was weak because I distrusted my ability to carry conviction. I cared for the consequence instead of leaving it to God. And therefore in my weakness I said the boys, after leaving schools, could roam about the streets, follow the same course of instruction or best of all take to hand spinning * till Swaraj was established. I discovered soon after the Nagpur Congress resolution that I had erred in suggesting several alternatives. But the mischief was already done. It started in September last. I began to retrace my steps in January, but repair is always patch-work. And so the spinning wheel remains more or less an excrescence or an idle pastime in most non-co-operation schools. I should have boldly said the whole truth and suggested hand spinning and hand weaving as an integral part of the proposition regarding boycott of educational institutions. It is true that probably fewer students would have come out. But they would have done far greater work than all the thousands who have left schools and colleges without a definite notion about the alternative. They would by this time have become experts in hand spinning and in hand weaving, and our Swadeshi work would have been easier. I know that the students and the professors of non-co-operation schools are doing their best. But it must be admitted that they are labouring under a handicap. They did not come with any conviction about hand spinning or Swadeshi in general. They simply

* See pages 439, 446.

considered the question, as they had a right to, from the educational standpoint. It was enough for them that they diminished the prestige of the Government by withdrawing from its educational institutions. It is hard on them now to be told that their boycott to be complete involved manufacture of yarn and khadi, that the preliminary training for the new method—the Swaraj type—of education meant during the war period the learning of hand spinning and the other processes of cloth manufacture and actual production.

But the mistake having been made, I at least must pay the penalty of trying patiently to convince the doubters that it would have been better to have insisted on hand-spinning as a necessary part of the educational item in non-co-operation. I invite those who share my belief to hasten to repair the mistake and earnestly take up the work of production of yarn and khadi in all national institutions which they influence. They will not ask me to supply them with teachers. I have far too few. But I jot down for them the processes that bale cotton which is what we usually have to-day has to go through. It must be first carded. There is no district in India which has no carders, *i. e.*, *pinjaras* or *dhunias*. They can card and a mere watching them for a day or two enables one to understand the process. A week's practice at the rate of six hours per day will enable one to card moderately well.

The carded cotton has to be turned into slivers or *punis*, an incredibly simple and easy process.

The cotton is now ready for hand spinning, which can be learnt from any spinner. Yarn to be yarn must

be free from dirt, even and well twisted. If it is not well twisted or even, it cannot be woven.

The next process is sizing. It is rather difficult to practise. I have no scientific formula giving the quantity of ingredients. It must be learnt from an experienced weaver.

Joining the thread is also a process to be separately learnt. It requires like cycling a little knack which is easily acquired.

Lastly comes weaving which is purely a matter of practice. One learns the principle in a day. The reader must not be surprised at the ease with which, I claim, processes can be learnt. All natural and necessary work is easy. Only it requires constant practice to become perfect, and it needs plodding. Ability to plod is Swaraj. It is Yoga. Nor need the reader be frightened of the monotony. Monotony is the law of nature. Look at the monotonous manner in which the sun rises. And imagine the catastrophe that would befall the universe, if the sun became capricious and went in for a variety of pastime. But there is a monotony that sustains and a monotony that kills. The monotony of necessary occupations is exhilarating and life-giving. An artist never tires of his art. A spinner who has mastered his art will certainly be able to do sustained work without fatigue. There is a music about the spindle which the practised spinner catches without fail. And when India has monotonously worked away at turning out Swaraj, she will have produced a thing of beauty which will be a joy for ever. But it cannot be without the spinning wheel. Therefore the best national education for India is undoubtedly an intelligent handling of the spinning wheel.

WANTED EXPERTS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 22, 1921.)

Attacks on hand spinning notwithstanding, I cling to the belief that Swaraj is unattainable without the beautiful art becoming universal in India. The reasoning applied to the proposition is incredibly simple. India cannot live unless her homes become self-supporting. They cannot become so, unless they have a supplementary occupation. It will, therefore, not avail if all our cloth was manufactured in our mills. If hand spinning became universal, every home would get a share of the crores and without any complicated machinery being necessary. And India is able to manufacture all her own cloth. It is understood that, when spinning becomes universal, the millions of weavers and lacs of carders will revert to their original occupation.

This is the economic aspect of hand spinning.

It will save our women from forced violation of their purity. It will, as it must, do away with begging as a means of livelihood. It will remove our enforced idleness. It will steady the mind. And I verily believe that when millions take to it as a sacrament, it will turn our faces Godward.

This is the moral aspect of spinning.

And when it has become universal and traffic in foreign cloth has become a thing of the past, it is the surest sign that India is earnest, sober, and believes in the non-violent and religious character of her struggle.

At present outsiders do not believe in our ability to boycott foreign cloth and manufacture enough for our requirements by hand spinning and hand weaving. But when it comes an established fact, India's opinion, too, will become an irresistible force, and if necessary, she can then, but not till then, resort to civil disobedience in order to bend a recalcitrant Government to its will.

This is the political aspect.

Therefore I was sad to see that in all Bengal I found no one who was a spinning expert and who devoted his whole time and attention to nothing but spreading the gospel of hand spinning, teaching, organising and advising. I found that the masses were ready to take it up, but they did not know how to go about it. What is true of Bengal is perhaps true of most provinces. We should have in each province a standard *charkha* and a body of experts to whom one can refer for advice and guidance. Much splendid talent could be utilised, if there was expert knowledge available. Who is to decide upon the utility or otherwise of over fifteen inventions that were exhibited in the National College Hall at Calcutta? I saw everywhere different kinds of *charkhas* in use. But I saw no attempt to test the capacity of these wheels. Thousands are spinning to-day in Bengal, but there is nobody to measure their work. I therefore advice all Congress Committees to set apart at least six men and six women with faith in their mission in this direction. They need not look to Satyagrahashram for personal guidance. What can be given is being imparted through the special articles that are being published weekly in these pages. I ask those who would become experts.

to study them with careful attention. But no one need expect to become an expert by merely studying those articles. Practice alone will make one perfect. Millions will spin for supplementing their resources, all will spin as a sacrament, some must spin for reducing it to a science. These latter must spin during the initial stage for eight hours per day. And as they spin on, they must match the quality of the yarn. They must measure every day their output and the exact time they have worked. They must learn the process of carding and weaving. They must know the different qualities of cotton, they must know the different types of wheels, and they must be able to execute ordinary repairs.

We will not attain Swaraj, unless we have organised ourselves in a methodical, intelligent and co-operative manner. Swadesli means non-co-operation in the second great department of national life.

We are boycotting, because we are now ready for manufacture of our cloth by hand spinning and hand weaving. But we will not be able to sustain the boycott, unless each one of us becomes a spinner during the transition period, and unless each province begins to organise its own production. This cannot be done if we have not a number of experts in each province.

CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1921.)

Probably very few workers have noticed that progress of hand spinning means the greatest voluntary co-operation the world has ever seen. It means co-operation among millions of human beings scattered over a very wide area and working for their daily bread. No doubt agriculture has required much co-operative effort, but hand spinning requires still greater and more honest co-operation. Wheat grows more by nature's honesty than by man's. Manufacture of yarn in our cottages is dependent solely on human honesty. Hand spinning is impossible without the willing and intelligent co-operation of millions of human beings. We have to arrive at a stage when the spinner like the grain seller is assured of a steady market for his yarn as well as the supply of cotton sliver, if he or she does not know the process of carding. Is it any wonder if I claim that hand spinning can drive away as if by magic the growing pauperism of the masses? An English friend sends me a newspaper cutting showing the progress of machinery in China. He has evidently imagined that in advocating hand spinning, I am propagating my ideal about machinery. I am doing nothing of the kind. I would favour the use of the most elaborate machinery if thereby India's pauperism and resulting idleness be avoided. I have suggested hand spinning as the only ready means of driving away penury and making famine of work and wealth impossible. The

spinning wheel itself is a piece of valuable machinery, and in my own humble way I have tried to secure improvements in it in keeping with the special conditions of India. The only question therefore that a lover of India and humanity has to address himself to is how best to devise practical means of alleviating India's wretchedness and misery. No scheme of irrigation or other agricultural improvement that human ingenuity can conceive can deal with the vastly scattered population of India or provide work for masses of mankind who are constantly thrown out of employment. Imagine a nation working only five hours per day on an average, and this, not by choice but by force of circumstances, and you have a realistic picture of India.

If the reader would visualise the picture, he must dismiss from his mind the busy fuss of the city life or the grinding fatigue of the factory life or the slavery of the plantations. These are but drops in the ocean of Indian humanity. If he would visualise the picture of the Indian skeleton, he must think of the eighty per cent. of the population which is working its own fields and which has practically no occupation for at least four months in the year and which therefore lives on the borderland of starvation. This is the normal condition. The ever recurring famines make a large addition to this enforced idleness. What is the work that these men and women can easily do in their own cottages so as to supplement their very slender resources? Does anyone still doubt that it is only hand spinning and nothing else? And I repeat that this can be made universal in a few months' time, if only the workers will. Indeed it is on a fair way

to becoming universal. Experts only are needed to organise it. People are ready, and what is most in favour of hand spinning is that it is not a new and untried method, but people have up to recently been using it. Its successful reintroduction does need skilful endeavour, honesty and co-operation on the largest scale known to the world. And if India can achieve this co-operation, who shall deny that India has by that one act achieved Swaraj.

INDIAN ECONOMICS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*December 8, 1921.*)

A friend has placed in my hands a bulletin on Indian Piece Goods Trade prepared by Mr. A. C. Coubrough, C. B. E., by order of the Government of India. It contains the following prefatory note: 'The Government of India desire it to be understood that the statements made and the views expressed in this bulletin are those of the author himself.' If so, why has the Government of India burdened the tax-payer with the expense of such bulletins? The one before me is 16th in the series. Do they publish both the sides of the question?

The bulletin under review is intended to be an answer to the Swadeshi movement. It is an elaborate note containing a number of charts showing the condition of imports and home manufacture of piece goods including hand woven. But it does not assist the reader in studying the movement. The painstaking author has bestowed no pains upon a study of the present movement

or its scope. That the Government of India treats the greatest constructive and co-operative movement in the country with supreme contempt and devotes people's money to a vain refutation instead of a sympathetic study and treatment is perhaps the best condemnation that can be pronounced upon the system under which it is carried.

The author's argument is :—

(1) The movement if successful will act not as a protective but a prohibitive tariff.

(2) This must result in merely enriching the Indian capitalist and punishing the consumer.

(3) The imports are non-competitive in that the bulk of the kind of piece goods imported are not manufactured in India.

(4) The result of boycotting such piece goods must be high prices without corresponding benefit.

(5) The boycott therefore being against the law of supply and demand and against the consumer, must fail in the end.

(6) The destruction of hand spinning which I have deplored is due to natural causes, *viz.*, the invention of time-saving appliances and was therefore inevitable.

(7) The Indian farmer is responsible for his own ruin in that he has indolently neglected cotton culture which was once so good.

(8) The best service I can render is therefore to induce the agriculturist to improve the quality of cotton.

(9) The author concludes, 'If, instead of filling homes with useless *Charkhas*, he were to start a propaganda for the more intensive cultivation of cotton and particularly for the production of longer stapled cotton, his influence

would be felt not only at the present day but for many generations to come.'

The reader will thus see that what I regard as the supreme necessity for the economical salvation of India, the author considers to be rank folly. There is therefore no meeting ground here. And, in spite of the prefatory note of the Government of India reproduced by me, the author does represent the Government attitude. I have invited them and the co-operators definitely to make common cause with the people in this movement at any rate. They may not mind its political implications because they do not believe in them. And surely they need not feel sorry, if, contrary to their expectation, the rise of the *Charlha* results in an increase in the political power of the people. Instead of waging war against *khadi*, they might have popularised its use and disarmed the terrible suspicion they labour under of wishing to benefit the foreign manufacturer at the expense of the Indian cultivator. My invitation is open for all time. I prophesy that, whatever happens to the other parts of the national programme, Swadeshi in its present shape will bide for ever and must, if India's pauperism is to be banished. . . .

And now for Mr. Coubrough's propositions.

(1) The movement is intended to serve the purpose of a voluntary prohibitive tariff.

(2) But it is so conceived as neither unduly to benefit the capitalist nor to injure the consumer. During the very brief transition stage, the prices of home manufactures may be, as they are, inflated. But the rise can only be temporary as the vast majority of consumers must

become their own manufacturers. This cottage manufacture of yarn and cloth cannot be expensive even as domestic cookery. Over twenty-five crores of the population will be doing their own hand spinning and having yarn thus manufactured woven in neighbouring localities. This population is rooted to the soil and has at least four months in the year to remain idle.

If they spin during those hours and have the yarn woven and wear it, no mill made cloth can compete with their *khadi*. The cloth thus manufactured will be the cheapest possible for them. If the rest of the population did not take part in the process, it could easily be supplied out of the surplus manufactured by the twenty-five crores.

(3) It is true that the non-competitive imports are larger than those that compete with the manufactures of Indian mills. In the scheme proposed by me, this question does not arise, because the central idea is not so much to carry on a commercial war against foreign countries as to utilise the idle hours of the nation and thus by natural processes to help it to get rid of her growing pauperism.

(4) I have already shown that the result of boycott cannot in the end be a rise in the price of cloth.

(5) The proposed boycott is not against the law of supply and demand, because it does away with the law by manufacturing enough for the supply. The movement does require a change of taste on the part of those who have adopted finer variety and who patronise fantastic combinations of colours and designs.

(6) I have shown, in these pages, that the destruction

of hand spinning was designed and carried out in most inhuman manner by the agents of the East India Company. No amount of appliances would ever have displaced this national art and industry but for this artificial and systematically cruel manner of carrying out the destruction.

(7) I am unable to hold the Indian farmer responsible for the deterioration in cotton culture. The whole incentive was taken away when hand spinning was destroyed. The state never cared for the cultivator.

(8) My activity, I am proud to think, has already turned the cultivator's attention to the improvement of cotton. The artistic sense of the nation will insist on fine counts for which long staple is a necessity. Cotton culture by itself cannot solve the problem of India's poverty. For it will still leave the question of enforced idleness untouched.

(9) I therefore claim for the *Charkha* the honour of being able to solve the problem of economic distress in a most natural, simple, inexpensive and businesslike manner. The *Charkha* therefore is not only not useless as the writer ignorantly suggests, but it is a useful and indispensable article for every home. It is the symbol of the nation's prosperity and therefore freedom. It is a symbol not of commercial war, but of commercial peace. It bears not a message of ill-will towards the nations of the earth but of good-will and self-help. It will not need the protection of a navy threatening a world's peace and exploiting its resources, but it needs the religious determination of millions to spin their yarn in their own homes as to-day they cook their food in their own homes. I may deserve the curses of posterity for many mistakes

of omission and commission, but I am confident of earning its blessings for suggesting a revival of the *Charkha*. I stake my all on it. For, every revolution of the wheel spins peace, goodwill and love. And with all that, inasmuch as the loss of it brought about India's slavery, its voluntary revival with all its implications must mean India's freedom.

THE CLOTH PROBLEM

(August 4, 1920.)

The cotton position of 1920 was the subject of a lecture recently delivered by Professor John A. Todd before a committee of the Lancashire section of the Textile Institute. Professor Todd had gone round practically the whole of the cotton belt in America.

He definitely told his audience: "America has failed us as our main source of textile fibre, and failed us, I think, permanently." And "it could only be a question of time," he said, "before we were faced with an actual scarcity of cotton." When the first cotton-producing country thus fails, England and other cloth manufacturing countries will naturally look to India and Egypt for the supply of cotton. Some provisions against the American shortage of cotton has been contemplated since a long time by European cloth manufacturers. Accordingly during the past quarter of a century, the area devoted to cotton in Egypt has been increased by over 90 per cent. The International Cotton Federation knocked at the doors of the India Office

and just before the war actually lifted the cotton crop in India from 3,000,000 to nearly 6,000,000 bales. With ten more years of peace, we have it on the authority of Sir Charles Macara, the quantity of Indian crop might have even equalled the American crop. Such an effort made by foreigners to increase the Indian cotton crop must awaken us to appreciate the importance of our cotton position. In view of the present shortage of the world's cotton supply, we may be said to be in a privileged position. We certainly produce cotton sufficient in quantity for ourselves here.

*

*

*

Besides, the scope of our cloth manufacture is not confined to cotton only. It can be seen from Mr. Rawlley's book on the silk of India that one of the very important potential assets of India has been elbowed into the background. The author has considered the subject not from the point of our market, but of the French and English markets. We, however, cannot forget that India is even now importing over 2,000,000 lbs. a year of raw silk, and consuming nearly all of it. If the researches (of foreigners) have brought it home to us that we produce sufficient raw material for our cloth, can produce even more, and can improve its quality (also, why should we import foreign raw material or foreign cloth? Our mills are no doubt too few to utilise the cotton or silk that we grow. Nor can we procure sufficient machinery from outside for a long time to come. Hand looms and spinning wheels therefore must be recalled to the rescue. It is certain that the cloth we weave on hand looms would be coarser and dearer than the

foreign fine fabrics. But it must be remembered that we cannot build our industries in a day and without any sacrifice on our part. England has gone through such a stage. In the middle of the 13th century legislation was passed there to assure sale for home made cloth. Simon De Montford, the founder of English Parliament, passed the first law of the series to protect English coarse cloth from foreign competition. Similar attempts are necessary in India to protect Indian cloth from foreign competition. Will the founders of our parliament or responsible government direct their efforts in that direction ? But in the absence of protective legislation, Swadeshi is the only remedy to secure demand for our home made cloth.

“HANDLOOMS OR POWERMILLS ?”

(July 28, 1920.)

Whenever an attempt has been made, as it is being made to-day, to encourage the use and production of hand spun and hand woven cloth, many have looked askance whether it is intended in this age of mechanical industrialism to supplant the latter by medieval hand looms. The issue is placed between the hand power and the power mill. A correspondent of the *Janmabhumi* falls into this common error. Apparently agitated at the idea of reviving the home industries, he exclaims: “The real question for consideration with us or with any people to-day is not whether the hand loom will or will not be able to hold its own against the power loom, or whether it cannot

feed millions of families or clothe millions more in home made dress; but which will contribute to the economic and political power of a nation or country. Whether it is the hand loom or the power mill? Handicrafts or machine industries?—that is the real issue.”

It is not quite clear from the above what the notions of the correspondent are about the economic and political power of this country. We cannot imagine him to seriously believe—though his argument runs as if he does—that that power can be achieved without feeding and clothing the millions of our half-starving and naked men, women and children. The political and economic power of a nation depends even in this “age of mechanical industrialism”, not on its powerful machines but on its powerful men. Germany was equipped with the best and most powerful and modern machinery, but it failed because at the last moment the power of its nation failed. We want to organise our national power. This can be done not by adopting the best methods of production only but by the best method of *both* the production and the distribution. Production, that is, the manufacture of cloth in this particular instance can be brought about in two ways; (1) by establishing new mills and increasing the output or producing capacity of each mill and (2) by increasing the number of hand looms and improving them. All these activities can go together. The notion of a competition between the hand loom and the power mill has been shown by such an eminent economist as Prof. Radha Kamal Mukerjea to be “altogether wrong.” Says Mr. Mukerjea in his *Foundation of Indian Economics* :

“The hand loom does not compete with the mill, it supplements it in the following way:

(1) It produces special kinds of goods which cannot be woven in the mills.

(2) It utilizes yarn below and above certain counts which cannot at present be used on the power mill.

(3) It will consume the surplus stock of Indian spinning mills which need not then be sent out of the country.

(4) Being mainly a village industry, it supplies the local demand, at the same time gives employment to small capitalists, weavers and other village workmen, and

(5) lastly, it will supply the long-felt want of an honest field of work and livelihood for educated Indians.”

But even this is not all that can be said in favour of hand loom industry. Mill industry no doubt can be a powerful aid to the promotion of Swadeshi. But apart from the bitter struggle, strife and demoralization of the capitalist and the workman (as explained by the eminent scholar, administrator and economist, the late Mr. Romesh Chundra Dutt) it has led to, the question is: Can it solve the problem which pure Swadeshi is designed and sought to do and which arises only because of its abandonment? Every writer of note on the industries of India, whatever his ideas and conclusions about the future of Indian Industrialism may be, has shown that there was a time—and that was even till the Early British Rule in India—where spinning and weaving, only next to agriculture, were the great national industries of India, when all the cotton was spun by hand and a very large portion of the work was done by the farming population which augmented its resources by spinning and weaving. Mr. Dutt has given

extracts from the statistical observations of Dr. Francis Buchanan's economic enquiries in Southern and Northern India, conducted between 1798 and 1814. They show how many hundreds of thousands of our men, women and children worked on this industry—mostly in their leisure time—each day and earned crores of rupees annually.

How our home industries came to the sad plight they are in to-day is an open secret, admitted by all authorities, and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that the problem to-day is not to bring about that political and economic re-organisation of our country, which disturbs the West to-day—an organisation which has led to the breaking up of the society by ceaseless struggles, bitterness and rupture between capital and labour. We want to work out the real political and economic regeneration of the country by Swadeshi. And the problem of the Swadeshi is the problem of 80 per cent. of our population who spend more than six months of the year in enforced idleness, eking, throughout the year, a miserable, half-starving and half-naked existence. We must find out suitable work for them during their idle hours. We must make them a real asset and power to the nation. Pure Swadeshi alone can do it.

MILL CLOTH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 23, 1922.)

If hand spun and hand woven *khaddar*, whether cotton, wool or silk, is to be the order of the day, what is the

place of mill cloth in the national economy, is the question often asked. If millions of villagers could receive, understand and take up the message of the spinning wheel to-day, I know that there is no room for mill cloth whether foreign or Indian in our domestic economy and that the nation will be all the better for its entire disappearance.

This statement has nothing to do with machinery or with the propaganda for boycott of foreign cloth. It is purely and simply a question of the economic condition of the Indian masses.

But unless Providence comes to the rescue and miraculously and immediately drives the masses to the spinning wheel as to a haven of refuge, the Indian mills must continue to supplement the *khaddar* manufacture for a few years to come at any rate. It is devoutly to be wished that a successful appeal could be made to the great mill owners to regard the mill industry as a national trust and that they should realise its proper place. The mill owners cannot wish to make money at the expense of the masses. They should on the contrary model their business in keeping with the national requirements and wipe out the reproach that was justly levelled against them during the Bengal partition agitation. Even now complaints continue to come from Calcutta and elsewhere that Indian mills are charging for their *dhoties* more than Manchester although their *dhoties* are inferior to the Manchester. If the information is correct, it is highly unpatriotic and such a policy of grab is likely to damage both the cause and the country. At the moment when the country is going through the travail of a new birth,

surely it is wicked to charge inordinate prices and thus not merely to stand aloof from the popular movement but actually to be callously indifferent to it.

The mill owners might also, if they will take a larger view of the situation, understand, appreciate and foster the *khaddar* movement and study the wants of the people and suit their manufactures to the new needs of the country.

But whether they do so or not, the country's march to freedom cannot be made to depend upon any corporation or groups of men. This is a mass manifestation. The masses are moving rapidly towards deliverance and they must move whether with the aid of the organised capital or without. This must therefore be a movement independent of capital and yet not antagonistic to it. Only if capital came to the aid of the masses, it would redound to the credit of the capitalists and hasten the advent of the happy day.

Nor was it otherwise before. India's history is not one of strained relations between capital and labour. The conception of four divisions is as religious as it is economic and political. And the condition has not been affected for the worse by the admixture of Islamic culture which is essentially religious and therefore beneficial to the poor. Islam seems to forbid the hoarding of capital as it literally forbids usury.

And even at the present moment it is not possible to say that capital is standing out. It was the modest capitalist who subscribed so liberally to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. But it has to be admitted with pain that the bulk of the mill owners unfortunately stood out. Manu-

facture of piece goods is the largest industry in the country. It is time for it to make its choice. Will it make it or will it drift ?

v. Boycott

IS BOYCOTT SWADESHI ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 14, 1920.)

Mr. Baptista has addressed himself to showing that Boycott is not only the same as Swadeshi in effect but is superior to it. His reasons for saying so are that, whilst it fully serves the purpose of Swadeshi in that it stimulates the use of home made articles, it produces an effect upon the British merchant and manufacturer by touching his pocket. Mr. Baptista adds that my opposition to boycott being purely a spiritual conception, is not understood by the British people, whereas they have always recognised boycott as a perfectly constitutional and legitimate weapon which they understand.

To say that boycott is the same as swadeshi even in effect is not to understand either. Swadeshi is an eternal principle whose neglect has brought untold grief to mankind. It means production and distribution of articles manufactured in one's own country. In its narrow and present form it means the saving of sixty crore rupees annually through the instrumentality of the peasant population. It therefore also means giving 72 per cent of the population a

much needed supplementary industry. Swadeshi is a constructive programme. Boycott, on the other hand, is a temporary makeshift resorted to in order to compel the hands of the British people by deliberately making an attempt to inflict a monetary loss upon them. Boycott, therefore, operates as an undue influence brought in to secure one's purpose. It may indirectly result, but not unless it is persistent and prolonged, in greater manufacture at home, but it certainly means the introduction of another disturbing factor, for, boycott does not mean exclusion of all foreign goods. It means exclusion of British goods only. It, therefore, involves greater encouragement of other foreign agencies, as, for instance, Japanese and American. I certainly do not contemplate with equanimity the evergrowing influence of Japan upon Indian trade and commerce.) Boycott to be effective has to be fairly universal whereas the observance of Swadeshi by a single person is so much to the national good. One can make boycott successful only by an appeal to angry passions. It may therefore result in unintended consequences and may even lead to a permanent estrangement between parties. Mr. Baptista, however, denies that appeal to angry passions is a necessary consequence of boycott especially if some one like me were to manage the movement. I venture to challenge the position. A man suffering from an injustice is exposed to the temptations of having his worst passions roused on the slightest pretext. By asking him to boycott British goods you inculcate the idea of punishing the wrong doer. And punishment necessarily evokes anger.

Mr. Zahoor Ahmed who has also written to combat

my position, says that withdrawal of co-operation is the same in essence as boycott, only it is far less effective because it is almost impossible of execution. Now, if I am serving—co-operating with—a wrong doer, I am participating in the wrong. Therefore withdrawal of co-operation becomes a duty when a wrong is serious. And even if one man ceases to co-operate, it is effective to that extent because of the performance of his duty by even one man. But since boycott is a punishment and as no punishment can be a duty, boycott unless it produces its effect, is wasted energy. And boycott by half a dozen persons is like hitting an elephant with a straw.

I admit, however, that my fundamental opposition to boycott is based on a spiritual conception. But that is to say that I am endeavouring to extend the spiritual law to the political world. I deny however that the British people will not understand it. I had no difficulty in making the Europeans of South Africa understand and appreciate it. Nor in order to render it effective, is it necessary to follow the spiritual conception of a spiritual act. My contention is that an act purely spiritual is the simplest to understand and the easiest to execute. Spirituality is nothing if it is not eminently practical. It is not difficult to understand that we must wash our hands when they are dirty. It is equally simple to do so, yet is essentially a spiritual practice. *Mens sana in corpore sano* is a doctrine of the soul. And even if we accept the necessity of cleaning dirty hands without a spiritual conception of cleanliness, so may we accept the practical failure of boycott and the practical necessity under definite conditions of non-

co-operation without waiting to understand their spiritual basis.

Is boycott then practical? Mr. Baptista has approved of boycott of the British goods. I hold that if the highest and permanent good of the country cannot be sufficient incentive to our merchants for supporting swadeshi to the exclusion of foreign goods, an appeal to the merchants that, in order to bring justice from the British people, they shall temporarily stop their custom, will, I venture to submit, fall flat. Boycott after the event is of no consequence. Boycott to influence, the result must be instantaneous. In my opinion we are not organised enough for instant action. The area of boycott is too large for any organisation that can be brought into being at a moment's notice. And I can see no difficulty about British manufacturers introducing their wares into India through Japan or America even as Germany years ago introduced into India her goods through England.

I swear by Swadeshi, because it is an evolutionary process gaining strength as it goes forward. Any organisation can serve it. It is independent of the justice or the injustice of the rulers or the British people. It is its own reward. "There is no waste of energy, no failure; even a little practice of this *Dharma* saves one from a great danger." Swadeshi and boycott are, therefore, not the same, but are at the opposite poles.

BOYCOTT OF GOODS *vs.* N.C.O. PROGRAMME

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*August 25, 1920.*)

Mr. Kasturi Ranga Ayengar was pleased to answer my argument in favour of the details of the first stage of non-co-operation that I had the honour of explaining at the great Madras beach meeting. He expressed his dissent from all but the renunciation of titles. He suggested boycott of foreign goods in the place of the other items. Even at the risk of repeating arguments familiar to the readers of *Young India*, I must deal with the question of boycott which has now received the imprimatur of so able a publicist as Mr. Kasturi Ranga Ayengar.

In the first place, boycott of British goods has been conceived as a punishment and can have no place in non-co-operation which is conceived in a spirit of self-sacrifice and is a matter of sacred duty.

Secondly, any measure of punishment must be swift, certain and adequate for the effect intended to be produced. Resorted to by individuals, therefore, boycott is ineffectual, for, it can give no satisfaction unless it is productive of effect, whereas every act of non-co-operation is its own satisfaction.

Thirdly, boycott of British goods is thoroughly unpractical, for, it involves sacrifice of their millions by millions. It is in my opinion infinitely more difficult for a merchant to sacrifice his millions than for a lawyer to suspend his practice or for a title holder to give up his title or for a parent to sacrifice, if need be, the literary

instruction of his children. Add to this the important fact that merchants have only lately begun to interest themselves in politics. They are therefore yet timid and cautious. But the class, to which the first stage of non-co-operation is intended to appeal, is the political class which has devoted years to politics and is not mentally unprepared for communal sacrifice.

Boycott of British goods to be effective must be taken up by the whole country at once or not at all. It is like a seige. You can carry out a seige only when you have the requisite men and instruments of destruction. One man scratching a wall with his finger nails may hurt his fingers but will produce no effect upon the walls. One title holder giving up his title has the supreme satisfaction of having washed his hands clean of the guilt of the donor and is unaffected by the refusal of his fellows to give up theirs. The motive of boycott* being punitive lacks the inherent practicability of non-co-operation. The spirit of punishment is a sign of weakness. A strengthening of that spirit will retard the process of regeneration. The spirit of sacrifice is a determination to rid ourselves of weakness. It is therefore an invigorating and purifying process and is therefore also calculated to do good both to us and to those who evoke the spirit of sacrifice in us. Above all, if India has a mission of her own, she will not fulfil it by copying the doubtful example of the West and

* Mr. Gandhi, at the Calcutta Congress of Sept, 1920, consented for the inclusion of the item of boycott of foreign goods in his N. C. O. Resolution. On this, (page 267) he says "It is certainly our right and duty to discard everything foreign that is *necessary* if we can produce or manufacture it in our country." See also pages 383, 386.

making even her sacrifice materialistically utilitarian instead of offering a sacrifice spotless and pleasing even in the sight of God.

HOW TO BOYCOTT FOREIGN CLOTH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 6, 1921.)

It is needless to say, at this time of the day, that the proposed boycott of foreign cloth is not a vindictive measure, but is as necessary for national existence as breath is for life. The quicker, therefore, it can be brought about, the better for the country. Without it, Swaraj cannot be established or retained after establishment. It is of the highest importance to know how it can be brought about even before the first day of August next.

To arrive at the boycott quickly, it is necessary (1) for the mill-owners to regulate their profits and to manufacture principally for the Indian market, (2) for importers to cease to buy foreign goods. (A beginning has already been made by three principal merchants), (3) for the consumers to refuse to buy any foreign cloth and to buy *Khadi* wherever possible, (4) for the consumers to wear only *Khadi* cloth, mill cloth being retained for the poor who do not know the distinction between Swadeshi and Pardeshi, (5) for the consumers to use, till Swaraj is established and *Khadi* manufacture increased, *Khadi* just enough for covering the body, (6) for the consumers to destroy Pardeshi cloth, as they would destroy intoxi-

cating liquors on taking the vow of abstinence, or to sell it for use abroad, or to wear it out for all dirty work or during private hours.

It is to be hoped that all the parties referred to in the foregoing clauses will respond well and simultaneously. But in the end success depends upon the persistent determination of the consumer. He has simply to decline to wear the badge of his slavery.

WHY BURN ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1921.)

Critics have overwhelmed me with their rebuke regarding the burning of foreign cloth. After having considered every argument advanced against it, I cannot help saying that destruction is the best method of dealing with foreign cloth * The Provincial Congress Committee has left it optional to the givers to choose between destruction and despatch to Smyrna or elsewhere. The discussion of the question therefore lacks the importance it would have had if destruction had been the only method prescribed for dealing with foreign clothes. The propriety of destruction depends upon the intensity of one's belief in the necessity of discarding foreign cloth. Just as a converted teetotaler will not hand the contents of his wine cellar to a needy neighbour, so

* In his article on "How to boycott foreign cloth" in the *Young India* (See page 555.), Mr. Gandhi suggested, among others, the destruction of foreign cloth as a necessary means for arriving at the boycott quickly.

would a votary of Swadeshi, if he feels as keenly as the teetotaler, refuse to give to the poor the contents of his wardrobe. I hold that the wearing of foreign cloth in India is almost as bad as drinking. I am not sure that it is not even worse than drinking in some respects. For the last hundred and fifty years India has been importing foreign cloth at the expense of her great cottage industry, *i. e.*, spinning. As Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt has pointed out in his study of the history of the deliberately planned destruction of the spinning and weaving industries of India, Bihar which was once one of the richest provinces of India, was reduced to poverty by the systematic and cruel destruction of her flourishing industry of spinning and weaving. If we only realised the magnitude of the injury done by the East India Company and of the sin committed by us in yielding to the persecution of the Company's Gumastas or the temptations put in our way, we would hang our heads in shame. Our great national industry would not have perished, our women would not have been forced to labour on public roads, millions of our people would not have been obliged to remain a part of the year in enforced idleness if we could have retained Swadeshi. In my humble opinion cloth which revives such black memories and is a mark of our shame and degradation is fit only to be destroyed. It certainly cannot be given to the poor. We should have much greater regard for their feelings and their national culture than to think that we serve them by giving them what to us is a mark of our slavery. Should not India's poor have a sense of

patriotism? Should they not have feelings about dignity and self-respect in the same manner as we have? I would not have the meanest of us remain without a spirit of true patriotism. Just as we would or at least ought to recoil with horror from giving them rotten food or food we will not eat, so should we feel about giving them foreign cloth. A moment's thought would also show that much of the fineries we are throwing away are perfectly useless for the poor. Of what use can the dirty hats and caps stinking with our perspiration be to them, or the rich silk sadis and the finest muslins that are being given up? They had no value except for the wearers who loved these things. They cannot clothe the famine stricken. The things that are really useful to them are very few indeed. But I do not base my argument for destruction upon the uselessness of the clothing discarded. My argument goes much deeper if only because it is based upon a sentiment on which alone the noblest in us is and can be reared. Why should an Englishman resent an insult to a tattered flag? But he does, and rightly thinks that he must. What harm is there in gaining a million by concealing my faith for a moment? But I may not for the kingdom of the world. For exactly similar reasons we may not use foreign cloth for the poor in India. And it is after all making a convenience of an act of renunciation to send cloth thus discarded even to Smyrna or elsewhere abroad. But the moral objection to the despatch abroad is certainly not so strong as to its use at home.

BURNING IN BOMBAY

(August 4, 1921.)

[On 31st July, 1921, boycott of foreign cloth was begun in earnest and on that day a large collection of costly and fine foreign clothes was burnt in Bombay as the best means of disposing them. * On the next day at the meeting held to commemorate the anniversary of the late Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the following address by Mr. Gandhi was distributed to the audience :—]

* Writing on this in *Young India* of August 11, 1921, Mr. Gandhi said —If any body had any doubt as to the necessity and the practical value of burning foreign clothes, those who witnessed the ceremony at Mr. Sobani's yard in Parel must have had their doubts set at rest. It was a most inspiring sight witnessed by thousands of spectators. And as the flame leapt up and enveloped the whole pyramid, there was a shout of joy resounding through the air. It was as if our shackles had been broken asunder. A glow of freedom passed through that vast concourse. It was a noble act nobly performed. It has, I am sure, struck the imagination of the people as nothing else could have so far as Swadeshi is concerned. And it was as well that it was not rags that were burned, but some of the finest sadis, shirts and jackets were consigned to the flames. I know that in some cases choicest silks kept by mothers for their daughters' wedding were given up for burning. The value consisted in destroying such costly things. Not less than one lac and a half pieces were burnt including articles worth several hundred rupees each. I am sure it was all for the good of the country. It would have been a crime to have given such things to the poor. Just imagine the poor people wearing the richest silks. To say the least it would have been highly martistic and incongruous. The fact is that the majority of the articles burnt had no correspondence with the life of the poor. The dress of the middle classes had undergone such a transformation that it was not fit to be given to the poor people. It would have been like giving discarded 'costly toilet brushes to them. I hope therefore that the burning process will continue and spread from one end of India to the other and not stop till every article of foreign clothing has been reduced to ashes or sent out of India.

It was the magic of Lokamanya Tilak's name that brought together the two lacs of men and women on Mr. Sobani's ground yesterday. It was to me a soul-stirring sight. Bombay the Beautiful lit yesterday a fire which must remain for ever alive even as in a Parsi temple and which must continually burn all our pollutions, as yesterday we burnt our greatest outward pollution, namely, our foreign clothing. Let it be a token of our determination never to touch foreign cloth. Untouchability of foreign cloth must be held to be a duty with every Hindu, Mussalman, Jain, Sikh, Parsi, Christian, Jew and all other religious communities which have made India their home. Let it be a common necessary factor for all Indian creeds. Untouchability of foreign cloth is as much a virtue with all of us as untouchability of the suppressed classes must be a sin with every devout Hindu.) It was therefore a noble sacrifice we made yesterday. Bombay qualified herself for celebrating Lokamanya's memory. Let us treasure the memory of his great self-sacrifice, his dauntless courage and his austere simplicity. He made patriotism a religion. Let us dedicate ourselves for realisation of his dream of Swaraj. No memorial less than Swaraj can fittingly perpetuate his memory.

And as I said yesterday, there is no deliverance for India without true Swadeshi. It was the true and necessary sacrificial fire we lit yesterday.

As with the outer, so with the inner. To me, yesterday's outward fire is the symbol of the inner fire that should burn up all our weaknesses of the head or the heart. Our purified reason must show us the true

economics of Swadeshi. Our purified hearts must make us strong to withstand the temptation of yielding to the charms of foreign cloth. Howsoever good it may be outside India, it is not good enough for India.

If it was a true fire we lit yesterday, if it is a true homage we have met to-day to render to the memory of Lokamanya, we will take good care not to deceive ourselves or the nation. Khadi is on the fair way to become the state dress. It is not the foreign muslin that will henceforth deck our bodies on auspicious occasions, but the sacred Khadi reminiscent not of sweated labour or the enforced idleness and pauperism of India's millions, but of the reviving poetry of the home life and of the incoming prosperity of the poorest toiler. And if that is to be the significance of yesterday's sacrament and to-day's demonstration on the very spot where twelve months ago the sacred remains of our deceased countryman were cremated, there must be no turning back upon our resolution, there must be no make-believe, no mere show. We must give up the use of foreign cloth once for all. We must realise that foreign cloth in our possession is valueless, even as the richest milk, if it is discovered to be infected, is fit only to be thrown away. If we are no longer to wear foreign cloth, is it not so much burden locked up in our trunks? Do they not in Europe give up valuable things when they have gone out of fashion? I utter this word of caution at this early stage, because I know that many have given up only a part of their foreign clothing in the hope, evidently, that some day they might be able to wear what they kept. Collection of foreign cloth is not like collection of funds and jewellery of

which only a part need be given by many. Collection of foreign cloth is like collection of refuse, every particle of which an industrious and careful housewife puts in the dust-bin. So much depends upon our ability to revolutionize our taste for the tinsel splendour, if the shops for the sale of foreign cloth are to be an exception in our bazars. Let us not hanker after imitations. If we do, we are likely to have fraudulent imitations of Khadi from foreign markets. For the time being and during the transition period, the coarser and unwashed Khadi is the best.

I swear by Swadeshi, as it affords occasion for an ample exercise of all our faculties and as it tests every one of the millions of men and women, young and old. It can succeed only if India *acts as one mind*. And if India can do so in Swadeshi, she will have learnt the secret of Swaraj. She will then have mastered the art of destruction and construction in a scientific manner.

To us the spot where we burnt a part of our sins yesterday has become hallowed. Let me hope that Mr. Sobani who has already contributed generously to the movement and who has given his son to it, will part with just the plot on which the sacrificial fire was lighted and enable the nation to erect a fitting monument to commemorate the sacred event. And so must we acquire this site where we have met to-day and where we cremated the remains of Lokamanya. Here out of his ashes rose the force of non-co-operation. It was on the 1st of August last that non-co-operation was inaugurated. And it was in Parel on Mr. Sobani's ground yesterday that the nation commenced—what is to me almost the

final stage in its march towards Swaraj. May God grant that India shall not be found wanting on the 30th of September next.

A word about the volunteers, and I have done. We are often accused of incapacity of organisation. Yet there was no police needed yesterday, and there was no mishap. All work from collection down to burning was organised by the volunteers. All honour to them and the other helpers. It is by such patient, silent and peaceful effort that we hope to win freedom's battle.

ETHICS OF DESTRUCTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 1, 1921.)

The reader, I am sure, will appreciate my sharing with him the following pathetic and beautiful letter from Mr. Andrews :—

“ I know that your burning of foreign cloth is with the idea of helping the poor, but I feel that there you have gone wrong. If you succeed in boycotting all, or a greater part, of foreign cloth, it seems to me self-evident that the price of mill-made cloth will rise and it will hit the poor. But there is besides a subtle appeal to racial feeling in that word ‘foreign’ which day by day seems to me to need checking and not fomenting. The picture of you lighting that great pile, including beautiful fabrics, shocked me intensely. We seem to be losing sight of the great beautiful world to which we belong and concentrating selfishly on India, and this must (I fear) lead back to the old bad selfish nationalism. If so we get into the vicious circle from which Europe is now trying so desperately to escape. But I cannot argue it out. I can only say again, that it shocked me and seemed to me a form almost of violence, and yet I know how violence is abhorrent to you. I do not at all like this question of foreign cloth being made into a religion

I was supremely happy when you were dealing great giant blows at the great fundamental moral evils, drunkenness, drug-taking, untouchability, race arrogance, etc., and when you were, with such wonderful and beautiful tenderness, dealing with the hideous vice of prostitution. But lighting bonfires of foreign cloth and telling people it is a religious *sin* to wear it, destroying in the fire the noble handiwork of one's fellow men and women, one's brothers and sisters abroad, saying it would be 'defiling' to wear it—I cannot tell you how different all this appears to me. Do you know I almost fear now to wear the *Khaddar* that you have given me, lest I should appear to be judging other people as a Pharisee would, saying, "I am holier than thou!" I never felt like this before.

"You know how, when anything that you do hurts me, I must cry out to you and this has hurt me.

"I wrote the *Modern Review* articles which I have enclosed with such eager joy, because I felt certain that I had found your own life's meaning. But now my mind cries out to you that you are doing something violent, distorted, unnatural You know that my love is stronger than ever, just as your love for your brother was when you felt he was doing something wrong. Do tell me what you mean. What you said in *Young India* about burning did not convince me a bit."

It is so like him. Whenever he feels hurt over anything I have done (and this is by no means the first such occasion), he deluges me with letters without waiting for an answer. For it is love speaking to love, not arguing. It is the outpouring of an anguished heart. And so it has been over the burning of foreign clothes.

What Mr. Andrews has put in loving language, correspondents already out of tune with me have written in coarse, angry and even vulgar words. Mr. Andrews' being words of love and sorrow have gone deep down in me and command a full answer, whereas the angry ones I was obliged to lay aside save for a passing reference. Mr. Andrews' being non-violent, charged with love, have told. The others being violent, charged with malice, took no effect and would have evoked angry retorts, if I was.

capable of or disposed to such retorts. Mr. Andrews' letter is a type of non-violence we need in order to win Swaraj quickly.

This is however by the way. I remain just as convinced as ever of the necessity of burning. There is no emphasis in the process on race feeling. I would have done precisely the same thing in the sacred and select family or friendly circles. In all I do or advise, the infallible test I apply is, whether the particular action will hold good in regard to the dearest and the nearest. The teaching of the faith I hold dear is unmistakable and unequivocal in the matter. I must be the same to friend and foe. And it is this conviction which make me so sure of so many of my acts which often puzzle friends.

I remember having thrown into the sea a pair of beautiful field-glasses, because they were a constant bone of contention between a dear friend and myself. He felt the hesitation at first, but he saw the right of the destruction of a beautiful and costly thing, a present withal from a friend. Experience shows that the richest gifts must be destroyed without compensation and hesitation if they hinder one's moral progress. Will it not be held a sacred duty to consign to the flames most precious heirlooms, if they are plague infected? I can remember having broken to bits, when a young man, the loved bangles of my own dear wife, because they were a matter of difference between us. And if I remember right, they were a gift from her mother. I did it, not out of hate, but out of love—ignorant, I now see in my ripe age. The destruction helped us and brought us nearer.)

“If the emphasis were on all foreign things, it would be

racial, parochial and wicked. The emphasis is on all foreign cloth. The restriction makes all the difference in the world. I do not want to shut out English lever watches or the beautiful Japanese lacquer work. But I must destroy all the choicest wines of Europe, even though they might have been prepared, and preserved with all the most exquisite care and attention. Satan's snares are most subtly laid and they are the most tempting, when the dividing line between right and wrong is so thin as to be imperceptible. But the line is there all the same, rigid and inflexible. Any crossing of it may mean certain death.

India is racial to-day. It is with the utmost effort that I find it possible to keep under check the evil passions of the people. The general body of the people are filled with ill-will, because they are weak and hopelessly ignorant of the way to shed their weakness. I am transferring the ill-will from men to things.

Love of foreign cloth has brought foreign domination, pauperism and what is worst, shame to many a home. The reader may not know that not long ago hundreds of 'untouchable' weavers of Kathiawad having found their calling gone, became sweepers for the Bombay municipality. And the life of these men has become so difficult that many lose their children and become physical and moral wrecks ; some are helpless witnesses of the shame of their daughters and even their wives. The reader may not know that many women of this class in Gujarat for want of domestic occupation have taken to work on public roads, where under pressure of one sort or another, they are obliged to sell their honour. The reader may not

know that the proud weavers of the Punjab, for want of occupation, not many years ago took to the sword, and were instrumental in killing the proud and innocent Arabs at the bidding of their officers, and not for the sake of their country but for the sake of their livelihood. It is difficult to make a successful appeal to these deluded hirelings and wean them from their murderous profession. What was once an honourable and artistic calling is now held by them to be disreputable. The weavers of Dacca, when they wove the world-famous *subnum*, could not have been considered disreputable.

Is it now any wonder, if I consider it a sin to touch foreign cloth? Will it not be a sin for a man with a very delicate digestive apparatus to eat rich foods? Must he not destroy them or give them away? I know what I would do with rich foods, if I had a son lying in bed who must not eat them but would still gladly have them. In order to wean him from the hankering, I would, though able to digest them myself, refrain from eating them and destroy them in his presence, so that the sin of eating may be borne home to him.)

If destruction of foreign cloth be a sound proposition from the highest moral standpoint, the possibility of a rise in the price of Swadeshi cloth need not frighten us. Destruction is the quickest method of stimulating production. By one supreme effort and swift destruction, India has to be awakened from her torpor and enforced idleness. Here is what Mr. Allen, the author of the Assam Gazetteer, wrote in 1905 of Kamrup:—

“Of recent years, the use of imported clothing has been coming into favour,—an innovation which has little

to recommend it, as the time formerly spent at the loom is not as a rule assigned to any other useful occupation."

The Assamese, to whom I have spoken, realise the truth of these words to their cost. Foreign cloth to India is like foreign matter to the body. The destruction of the former is as necessary for the health of India as of the latter for the health of the body. Once grant the immediate necessity of Swadeshi, and there is no half-way house to destruction.

Nor need we be afraid, by evolving the fullest Swadeshi spirit, of developing a spirit of narrowness and exclusiveness. We must protect our own bodies from disruption through indulgence, before we would protect the sanctity of others. India is to-day nothing but a dead mass movable at the will of another. Let her become alive by self-purification, *i. e.*, self-restraint and self-denial, and she will be a boon to herself and mankind. Let her be carelessly self-indulgent, aggressive, grasping; and if she rises, she will do so like Kumbhakarna only to destroy and be a curse to herself and mankind.

And for a firm believer in Swadeshi, there need be no Pharisaical self-satisfaction in wearing *Khadi*. A Pharisee is a patron of virtue. The wearer of *Khadi* from a Swadeshi standpoint is like a man making use of his lungs. A natural and obligatory act has got to be performed, whether others do it out of impure motives or refrain altogether, as they do not believe in its necessity or utility.

ESSENTIALS OF SUCCESS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 11, 1921.)

To finish the boycott of foreign cloth programme before the 30th September next, it is no doubt necessary to revise our taste, revert to simplicity and cut down our wants to a minimum. No non-co-operator can afford to wear more than three articles of dress. We must not hanker after the Bezwada fineries, but must be satisfied with the coarsest Khadi. But this is only a preliminary. Swadeshi will fail if we are not businesslike. We have hitherto tried to act on the students and they have responded to the best of their lights and ability. Many non-co-operation students are doing valiant work as pickets or propagandists. A non-co-operation school attracts to it all public activity. But we cannot achieve full success in Swadeshi through the school boys only. We must touch the hearts of the weavers of India. We must organise them. Those weavers who for want of scope for their art have left their calling should be induced to come back to it. We must hold their meetings and tell them why they should weave hand spun yarn even though it may be uneven, and why they should consider it a sin to touch foreign yarn. Similarly we must induce carders (dhunias) to prepare slivers for spinning. We must also induce clothiers to introduce patriotism into their trade and sell hand spun cloth and give up selling foreign cloth. We must have for Swadeshi shops inspectors who are experts in distinguishing between

foreign cloth and Swadeshi and between hand-spun and machine-spun. This great work cannot be done unless we are able to organise ourselves on a grand scale. And such organisation is utterly impossible unless every Congress body is able to concentrate upon Swadeshi, *i.e.*, boycott and production to the exclusion of every other activity.

The ideal no doubt is for every village to spin and weave for itself just as to-day most villages grow for themselves. It is easier for every village to spin and weave for itself than to grow all its corn. Every village cannot grow wheat or rice, but every village can stock enough cotton and spin and weave without any difficulty. But it must be some time before we can arrive at that happy state. Meanwhile those provinces that are at all organised for the work, for instance the Punjab, must not only immediately exclude all foreign cloth from their own markets but must send out to the parts of India that need their superfluous stock of Khadi. Panjab, Andhra, Bihar und Gujarat seem to be the best organised provinces for the manufacture of Khadi. And they must busy themselves with the work so as to anticipate a famine of Khadi.

And if we would do this great and glorious work, we must cease to talk, or if we do talk, our talk must take the shape of business. We must cease to wrangle and offer hair-splitting objections to every position, as also to take interest in them if any one insists on indulging in these things. The Congress must cease to be a debating society of talented lawyers who do not leave their practice, but it must consist of producers and manufacturers, and

these who would understand them, nurse them and voice their feelings. Practising lawyers can help by becoming silent workers and donors. I sympathise with them for their desire to be in the limelight. But I would urge them to recognise their limitations. Their day will come when the nation is again in a position to go to law courts and debating assemblies for justice or legislation. To-day it has no faith in either, for they are corrupt beyond description. Both law and law courts fail to do justice when the question is between the Government and the people. The test of their usefulness lies in their ability to adjudicate evenly between the two parties, not in their giving just laws as between different parts composing the people. The latter justice is like that of the lion interposing to keep the lambs from eating one another or dying of disease so that he may have all of them for food.

TO THE WOMEN OF INDIA

(August 11, 1921.)

Dear Sisters,

The All-India Congress Committee has come to a momentous decision in fixing the 30th September next as the final date for completing the boycott of foreign cloth begun by the sacrificial fire lit on the 31st July in Bombay in memory of Lokamanya Tilak. I was accorded the privilege of setting fire to the huge pile containing costly saris and other dresses which you have hitherto considered fine and beautiful. I feel that it was right

and wise on the part of the sisters who gave their costly clothing. Its destruction was the most economical use you could have made of it, even as destruction of plague-infected articles is their most economical and best use. It was a necessary surgical operation designed to avert more serious complaints in the body politic.

The women of India have during the past twelve months worked wonders on behalf of the motherland. You have silently worked away as angels of mercy. You have parted with your cash and your fine jewellery. You have wandered from house to house to make collections. Some of you have even assisted in picketing. Some of you who were used to fine dresses of variegated colours and had a number of changes during the day, have now adopted the white and spotless but heavy Khadi sari reminding one of a woman's innate purity. You have done all this for the sake of India, for the sake of the Khilafat, for the sake of the Punjab. There is no guile about your word or work. Yours is the purest sacrifice untainted by anger or hate. Let me confess to you that your spontaneous and loving response all over India has convinced me that God is with us. No other proof of our struggle being one of self-purification is needed than that lacs of India's women are actively helping it.

Having given much, more is now required of you. Men bore the principal share of the subscriptions to the Tilak-Swaraj Fund. But completion of the Swadeshi programme is possible only if you give the largest shares. Boycott is impossible, *unless you will surrender the whole of your foreign clothing*. So long as the taste persists, so long is com-

plete renunciation impossible. And boycott means complete renunciation. We must be prepared to be satisfied with such cloth as India can produce, even as we are thankfully content with such children as God gives us. I have not known a mother throwing away her baby even though it may appear ugly to an outsider. So should it be with the patriotic women of India about Indian manufactures. And for you only hand spun and hand woven can be regarded as Indian manufactures. During the transition stage you can only get coarse Khadi in abundance. You may add all the art to it that your taste allows or requires. And if you will be satisfied with coarse Khadi for a few months, India need not despair of seeing a revival of the fine rich and coloured garments of old which were once the envy and the despair of the world. I assure you that a six months' course of self-denial will show you that what we to-day regard as artistic is only falsely so, and that true art takes note not merely of form but also of what lies behind. There is an art that kills and an art that gives life. The fine fabric that we have imported from the West or the Far East has literally killed millions of our brothers and sisters, and delivered thousands of our dear sisters to a life of shame. True art must be evidence of happiness, contentment and purity of its authors. And if you will have such art revived in our midst, the use of Khadi is obligatory on the best of you at the present moment.

And not only is the use of Khadi necessary for the success of the Swadeshi programme, but it is imperative for every one of you to spin during your leisure hours.

have suggested to boys and men also that they should spin. Thousands of them, I know, are spinning daily. But the main burden of spinning must, as of old, fall on your shoulders. Two hundred years ago, the women of India spun not only for home demand but also for foreign lands. They spun not merely coarse counts but the finest that the world has ever spun. No machine has yet reached the fineness of the yarn spun by our ancestors. If then we are to cope with the demand for Khadi during the two months and afterwards, you must form spinning clubs, institute spinning competitions and flood the Indian market with hand spun yarn. For this purpose some of you have to become experts in spinning, carding and adjusting the spinning wheels. This means ceaseless toil. You will not look upon spinning as a means of livelihood. For the middle class it should supplement the income of the family, and for very poor women, it is undoubtedly a means of livelihood. The spinning wheel should be, as it was, the widow's loving companion. But for you who will read this appeal, it is presented as a duty, as *Dharma*. If all the well-to-do women of India were to spin a certain quantity daily, they would make yarn cheap and bring about much more quickly than otherwise the required fineness.

The economic and the moral salvation of India thus rests mainly with you. The future of India lies on your knees, for you will nurture the future generation. You can bring up the children of India to become simple, God-fearing and brave men and women, or you can coddle them to be weaklings unfit to brave the storms of life and used to foreign fineries which they would find it difficult

in afterlife to discard. The next few weeks will show of what stuff the women of India are made. I have not the shadow of a doubt as to your choice. The destiny of India is far safer in your hands than in the hands of a Government that has so exploited India's resources that she has lost faith in herself. At every one of women's meetings, I asked for blessings for the national effort, and I have done so in the belief that you are pure, simple and godly enough to give them with effect. You can ensure the fruitfulness of your blessings by giving up your foreign cloth and during your spare hours ceaselessly spinning for the nation.

I remain,
Your Devoted Brother,
M. K. GANDHI.

THE POOR MAN'S WAY

(September 29, 1921.)

Mr. Gandhi has issued the following appeal to the public:—

Only a few days are left for us to complete the boycott of foreign cloth enjoined by the All-India Congress Committee. It is not yet too late if every Congress worker will devote his or her exclusive attention to the boycott. If every one realises that without Swadeshi; *i. e.*, boycott of foreign cloth and manufacture of all the required cloth by hand spinning and hand weaving, there is no Swaraj, and without Swaraj there is no settlement of the Khilafat and the Punjab problems, there should be

no difficulty in bringing about the desired boycott and the required manufacture.

I know that many will find it difficult to replace their foreign cloth all at once. Millions are too poor to buy enough *Khadi* to replace the discarded cloth. To them I repeat my advice given on the Madras beach. Let them be satisfied with a mere loin cloth. In our climate we hardly need more to protect our bodies during the warm months of the year. Let there be no prudery about dress. India has never insisted on full covering of the body for the males as a test of culture.

I give the advice under a full sense of my responsibility. In order, therefore, to set the example, I propose to discard at least up to the 31st of October my *topi* and vest, and to content myself with only a loin cloth and a *chaddar* whenever found necessary for the protection of the body. I adopt the change, because I have always hesitated to advise anything I may not myself be prepared to follow, also because I am anxious, by leading the way, to make it easy for those who cannot afford a change on discarding their foreign garments. I consider the renunciation to be also necessary for me as a sign of mourning, and a bare head and a bare body is such a sign in my part of the country. That we are in mourning is more and more being borne home to me, as the end of the year is approaching and we are still without Swaraj. I wish to state clearly that I do not expect co-workers to renounce the use of the vest and *topi* unless they find it necessary to do so for their own work.)

I am positive that every district can, if there are enough workers, manufacture sufficient for its needs in

one month. And to that end for one month I advise complete suspension of every activity but Swadeshi. I would even withdraw pickets from shops trusting the drinker to recognise the new spirit of purification. I would advise every non-co-operator to treat imprisonment as his ordinary lot in life and not think anything about it. If only we can go through the course of organising manufacture and collecting foreign cloth during the month of October abstaining from all meetings and excitements, we shall produce an atmosphere calm and peaceful enough to embark upon civil disobedience if it is then found necessary. But I have a settled conviction that, if we exhibit the strength of character, the faculty for organising and the power of exemplary self-control, all of which are necessary for full Swadeshi, we shall attain Swaraj without more.

30TH SEPTEMBER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 6, 1921.)

The All-India Congress Committee after a full debate fixed 30th September as the final date for completing the boycott of foreign cloth. The choice lay between 30th September and 30th October. The argument advanced in favour of September was, that if boycott could be completed in October, it should be possible in September. It must be confessed that we have failed in fulfilling our resolution. Much work has certainly been done. *Khadi* has become much more popular and even fashionable. In

many places the quality has also improved. There are certainly many more spinning wheels working, many new looms have been made, and in the ordinary course the progress made would be considered satisfactory. But as a war measure the record is altogether small.

After all the success of the movement depends upon the consumer. The importer has certainly helped. But the consumer has been satisfied with a partial boycott. He has given up his cap chiefly. Some have parted with their vests but very few with their dhotars. The consumers have not helped manufacture to an appreciable degree. Manufacture of yarn has been confined to the poor. The consumer has not realised the necessity of a complete change. He has not visualised the new life we must lead under Swaraj. It is not by temporising we shall succeed. A complete transformation is a necessity of the case.

At the same time I saw in Bengal as well as Madras that the desire was there. Most people were hopeful, and said that with a little more time they would be able to organise manufacture without difficulty. In the matter of Swadeshi the women presented greater difficulty. They could not reconcile themselves to the change so readily as men. But it is the overcoming of these difficulties that would give us courage, hope, stamina and above all, knowledge of the true condition of India. Swadeshi means a real industrial revival and consequent disappearance of grinding and growing pauperism in the land. And when we have found ourselves able to become self-contained without state aid regarding our cloth supply and have solved

what had appeared to be an insoluble problem for the poverty of India, we shall have confidence in our ability to manage our own affairs.

To-day Sir William Vincent is able to make us dance to his tune. He makes the self-styled representatives of the people believe that the British power alone can protect the interests of the minorities, he is able to convince them that all these long years India has proved unable to find officers and men who could defend her borders against invaders.

But all this will be changed, Sir William himself will play a different tune, when he finds that without the British power and indeed in spite of it, we are able to dispense with foreign aid for the supply of our vital needs.

Swadeshi is our Khilafat, it is our cow of plenty. When we have protected Swadeshi, we shall find that we have the power to protect the Khilafat, and that we have the ability to manage our own affairs including the defence of our borders.

If thirty crores of people *will*, if the crore members of the Congress *will*, I am sure that we can boycott foreign cloth and manufacture enough for our wants during this month. Three conditions are necessary; we must discard all foreign cloth, do with the least possible cloth during the transition stage, and get all the *Khadi* we need woven by the village weaver out of yarn spun by ourselves or our neighbours.

vi. Hindu-Muslim Unity

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 11, 1920.)

That unity is strength is not merely a copy book maxim but a rule of life, is in no case so clearly illustrated as in the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity. Divided we must fall. Any third power may easily enslave India so long as we Hindus and Mussalmans are ready to cut each other's throats. Hindu-Muslim unity means not unity only between Hindus and Mussalmans but between all those who believe India to be their home, no matter to what faith they belong.

I am fully aware that we have not yet attained that unity to such an extent as to bear any strain. It is a daily growing plant, as yet in delicate infancy, requiring special care and attention. The thing became clear in Nellore when the problem confronted me in a concrete shape. The relations between the two were none too happy. They fought only about two years ago over what appeared to me to be a small matter. It was the eternal question of playing music whilst passing mosques. I hold that we may not dignify every trifle into a matter of deep religious importance. Therefore a Hindu may not insist on playing music whilst passing a mosque. He may not even quote precedents in his own or any other place for the sake of playing music. It is not a matter of vital importance for him to play music whilst

passing a mosque. One can easily appreciate the Mussalman sentiment of having solemn silence near a mosque the whole of the twenty-four hours. What is a non-essential to a Hindu may be an essential to a Mussalman. And in all non-essential matters a Hindu must yield for the asking. It is criminal folly to quarrel over trivialities. The unity we desire will last only if we cultivate a yielding and a charitable disposition towards one another. The cow is as dear as life to a Hindu; the Mussalman should therefore voluntarily accommodate his Hindu brother. Silence at his prayer is a precious thing for a Mussalman. Every Hindu should voluntarily respect his Mussalman brother's sentiment. This however is a counsel of perfection. There are nasty Hindus as there are nasty Mussalmans who would pick a quarrel for nothing. For these we must provide Panchayats of unimpeachable probity and imperturbability whose decisions must be binding on both parties. Public opinion should be cultivated in favour of the decisions of such panchayats so that no one would question them.

I know that there is much, too much distrust of one another as yet. Many Hindus distrust Mussalman honesty. They believe that Swaraj means Mussalman Raj, for they argue that without the British, Mussalmans of India will aid Mussalman powers to build up a Mussalman empire in India. Mussalmans on the other hand fear that the Hindus being in an overwhelming majority will smother them. Such an attitude of mind betokens impotence on either's part. If not their nobility, their desire to live in peace would dictate a policy of mutual trust and mutual forbearance. There is nothing in either religion to keep the two apart.

The days of forcible conversion are gone. Save for the cow, Hindus can have no ground for quarrel with Mussalmans. The latter are under no religious obligation to slaughter a cow. The fact is we have never before now endeavoured to come together, to adjust our differences and to live as friends bound to one another as children of the same sacred soil. We have both now an opportunity of a life time. The Khilafat question will not recur for another hundred years. If the Hindus wish to cultivate eternal friendship with the Mussalmans, they must perish with them in the attempt to vindicate the honour of Islam.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 6, 1920.)

There can be no doubt that successful non-co-operation depends as much on Hindu-Muslim unity as on non-violence. Greatest strain will be put upon both in the course of the struggle and if it survives that strain, victory is a certainty.

A severe strain was put upon it in Agra * and it has been stated that when either party went to the authorities, they were referred to Maulana Shaukat Ali and me. Fortunately there was a far better man at hand. Hakimji Ajmal Khan is a devout Muslim who commands the confidence and the respect of both the parties. He with his band of workers hastened to Agra, settled the dispute, and the parties became friends as they were never before.

* Over the cow question.

An incident occurred nearer Delhi and the same influence worked successfully to avoid what might have become an explosion.

But Hakimji Ajmal Khan cannot be everywhere appearing at the exact hour as an angel of peace. Nor can Maulana Shaukat Ali or I go everywhere. And yet perfect peace must be observed between the two communities in spite of attempts to divide them.

Why was there any appeal made to the authorities at all at Agra? If we are to work out non-co-operation with any degree of success, we must be able to dispense with the protection of the Government when we quarrel among ourselves. The whole scheme of non-co-operation must break to pieces, if our final reliance is to be upon British intervention for the adjustment of our quarrels or the punishment of the guilty ones. In every village and hamlet there must be at least one Hindu and one Muslim whose primary business must be to prevent quarrels between the two. Sometimes, however, even blood-brothers come to blows. In the initial stages we are bound to do so here and there. Unfortunately we, who are public workers have made little attempt to understand and influence the masses and, least of all, the most turbulent among them. During the process of insinuating ourselves in the estimation of the masses and until we have gained control over the unruly, there are bound to be exhibitions of hasty temper now and then. We must learn at such times to do without an appeal to the Government. Hakimji Ajmal Khan has shown us how to do it.

The union that we want is not a patched up thing, but

a union of hearts based upon a definite recognition of the indubitable proposition that Swaraj for India must be an impossible dream without an indissoluble union between the Hindus and the Muslims of India. It must not be a mere truce. It cannot be based upon mutual fear. It must be a partnership between equals each respecting the religion of the other.

I would frankly despair of reaching such union if there was anything in the holy Quran enjoining upon the followers of Islam to treat Hindus as their natural enemies or if there was anything in Hinduism to warrant a belief in the eternal enmity between the two.

We would ill learn our history if we conclude that because we have quarrelled in the past, we are destined so to continue unless some such strong power like the British keep us by force of arms from flying at each other's throats. But I am convinced that there is no warrant in Islam or Hinduism for any such belief. True it is that interested or fanatical priests in both religions have set the one against the other. It is equally true that Muslim rulers like Christian rulers have used the sword for the propagation of their respective faiths. But in spite of many dark things of the modern times, the world's opinion to day will as little tolerate forcible conversions as it will tolerate forcible slavery. That probably is the most effective contribution of the scientific spirit of the age. That spirit has revolutionised many a false notion about Christianity as it has about Islam. I do not know a single writer on Islam who defends the use of force in the proselytising process. The influences exerted in our times are far more subtle than that of the sword.

I believe that in the midst of all the bloodshed, chicane and fraud being resorted to on a colossal scale in the West, the whole of humanity is silently but surely making progress towards a better age. And India by finding true independence and self-expression through an imperishable Hindu-Muslim unity and through non-violent means, *i. e.*, unadulterated self-sacrifice, can point a way out of the prevailing darkness.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1921.)

Everybody knows that without unity between Hindus and Mussalmans, no certain progress can be made by the nation. There is no doubt that the cement binding the two is yet loose and wet. There is still mutual distrust. The leaders have come to recognise that India can make no advance without both feeling the need of trust and common action. But though there is a vast change among the masses, it is still not a permanent quantity. The Mussalman masses do not still recognise the same necessity for Swaraj as the Hindus do. The Mussalmans do not flock to public meetings in the same numbers as the Hindus. This process cannot be forced. Sufficient time has not passed for the national interest to be awakened among the Mussalmans. Indeed it is a marvel that whereas but a year ago the Mussalmans as a body hardly took any interest in Congress affairs, all over India

thousands have registered themselves as members. This in itself is an immense gain.

But much more yet remains to be done. It is essentially the work of the Hindus. Wherever the Mussalmans are still found to be apathetic, they should be invited to come in. One often hears from Hindu quarters the complaint that Mussalmans do not join the Congress organisations or do not pay to the Swaraj Fund. The natural question is, have they been invited? In every district Hindus must make special effort to draw out their Mussalman neighbours. There will never be real equality so long as one feels inferior or superior to the other. There is no room for patronage among equals. Mussalmans must not feel the lack of education or numbers where they are in a minority. Deficiency in education must be corrected by taking education. To be in a minority is often a blessing. Superiority in numbers has frequently proved a hindrance. It is character that counts in the end. But I have not commenced this article to lay down counsels of perfection, or to state the course of conduct in the distant future.

My main purpose is to think of the immediate task lying before us. Bakr-Id will be soon upon us. What are we to do to frustrate the attempts that will then be made to foment quarrels between us—Hindus and Mussalmans? Though the situation has improved considerably in Bihar, it is not yet free from anxiety. Over-zealous and impatient Hindus are trying to force matters. They lend themselves an easy prey to the machinations of mischief makers not always prompted by the Government side. Protection of the cow is the nearest to the Hindu

heart. We are therefore apt to lose our heads over it and thus be unconsciously instrumental in doing an injury to the very cause we seek to espouse. Let us recognise that our Mussalman brethren have made great efforts to save the cow for the sake of their Hindu brethren. It would be a grave mistake to underrate them. But immediately we become assertive, we make all effort on their part nugatory. We have throughout all these many years put up with cow slaughter either without a murmur or under ineffective and violent protest. We have never tried to deserve self-imposed restraint on the part of our Mussalman countrymen by going out of our way to cultivate friendly relations with them. We have more or less gratuitously assumed the impossibility of the task.

But we are now making a deliberate and conscious attempt in standing by their side in the hour of their need. Let us not spoil the good effect by making our free offering a matter of bargain. Friendship can never be a contract. It is a status carrying no consideration with it. Service is a duty and duty is a debt which it is sin not to discharge. If we would prove our friendship, we must help our brethren whether they save the cow or not. We throw the responsibility for their conduct towards us on their shoulders. We dare not dictate it to them as consideration for our help. Such help will be hired service, which the Mussalmans cannot be blamed if they summarily reject. I hope, therefore, that the Hindus of Bihar and indeed all the parts of India will realise the importance of observing the strictest forbearance, no matter what the Mussalmans do on Bakr-Id.

We must leave them to do what course they choose. . . .

The greater the pressure put upon the Mussalmans, the greater must be the slaughter of the cow. We must leave them to their own sense of honour and duty. And we shall have done the greatest service to the cow.

The way to save the cow is not to kill or quarrel with the Mussalman. The way to save the cow is to die in the act of saving the Khilafat without mentioning the cow. Cow protection is a process of purification. It is *tapasya*, i. e., self-suffering. When we suffer voluntarily and therefore without expectation of reward, the cry of suffering (one might say) literally ascends to heaven, and God above hears it and responds. That is the path of religion, and it has answered even if one man has adopted it *in its entirety*. I make bold to assert without fear of contradiction, that it is not Hinduism to kill a fellow-man even to save the cow. Hinduism requires its votaries to immolate themselves for the sake of their religion, i. e., for the sake of saving the cow. The question is how many Hindus are ready without bargaining with the Mussalmans to die for them and for their religion? If the Hindus can answer it in the religious spirit, they will not only have secured Mussalman friendship for eternity, but they will have saved the cow for all time from the Mussalmans. Let us not swear even by the greatest among them. They can but help. They cannot undertake to change the hearts of millions of men who have hitherto given no thought to the feeling of their Hindu neighbours when they slaughter the cow. But God Almighty can in a moment change them and move them to pity. Prayer accom-

panied by adequate suffering is a prayer of the heart. That alone counts with God. To my Mussalman friends I would but say one word. They must not be irritated by the acts of irresponsible or ignorant but fanatical Hindus. He who exercises restraint under provocation wins the battle. Let them know and *feel* sure that responsible Hindus are not on their side in their trial in any bargaining spirit. They are helping because they know that the Khilafat is a just cause and that to help them in a good cause is to serve India, for they are even as blood-brothers, born of the same mother,—Bharata Mata.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY A CAMOUFLAGE ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 20, 1920.)

The editorial notes in the current number of the *Modern Review* contain reflections on Hindu-Muslim unity, which deserve a reply. The talented editor has headed them with the word 'camouflage,' and has evidently come to the conclusion that the unity is only so called. In my opinion, however, it is not only not a camouflage but is fast becoming a permanent reality. I have made the admission in these pages, that it is still a sapling requiring delicate handling. But it is certainly not a pretention or make believe if only because both realise the truth of the common danger.

It is unfortunately still true that the communal or the sectarian spirit is predominant. Mutual distrust is still there. Old memories are still alive. It is still true that

at elections considerations not of fitness but of religion prevail. But to recognise these facts is to recognise the difficulty of union. When both parties know them and are honestly trying to achieve unity in spite of them, it is hardly just to call the attempt or the limited achievement a camouflage.

It is not correct to say that the appeal of the Khilafat associations against cow killing leaves the Mussalmans cold and unresponsive. In the first place is it not a cheering phenomenon that Khilafat workers, themselves Mussalmans, are working to prevent cow killing? In the second place I venture to assure the editor that the appeal has had wonderful success in almost all parts of India. Is it a small matter that the burden of cow protection has been taken over almost entirely by the Mussalman workers? Was it not a soul-stirring thing for Hindus to witness Messrs. Chhotani and Khatri of Bombay rescuing hundreds of cows from their co-religionists and presenting them to the grateful Hindus?

It is certainly true that both Maulana Mahomed Ali and I are careful enough 'not to tread on each other's corns.' But for frankness of treatment it would be difficult to beat us. For us the unity is not 'a house of cards' as the writer cruelly suggests, but it is such a substantial fact that we would die to keep it intact. Let me inform the reader that throughout all our journeyings there has never been a jar between us, never any mental reservations. The cruellest cut however is given in the following sentence. 'Reading between the lines of their speeches, it is not difficult to see that with one of them the sad plight of the Khilafat in distant Turkey is the central

fact, while with the other the attainment of Swaraj here in India is the primary object in view.' I claim that with us both the Khilafat is the central fact, with Maulana Mahomed Ali because it is his religion, with me because in laying down my life for the Khilafat I ensure the safety of the cow, that is, my religion, from the Mussalman knife. Both hold Swaraj equally dear because only by Swaraj is the safety of our respective faiths possible. This may seem a lower ideal. But there is no concealment in it. For me the attainment of the Khilafat through India's power is the attainment of Swaraj. Love is the basis of our friendship as it is of religion. I seek to gain Mussalman friendship by right of love. And if love persists even on the part of one community, unity will become a settled fact in our national life. It is unjust to suggest of Maulana Mahomed Ali that he speaks in elegant Urdu understandable of the majority of Bengali Mussalmans. I know that he has been trying his best to introduce into his Urdu speech as much simplicity as possible.

It is unfortunately true that there are still Hindus and Mussalmans who out of fear of one another consider foreign domination a necessity. And that has not a little to do with the delay in the attainment of our goal. We do not yet clearly perceive that the possibility of a free fight between the two communities is a lesser evil than the existence of foreign domination. And if it is the interposition of the British Government which keeps us from fighting one another, the sooner we are left free to fight, the better for our manhood, our respective religions and our country. It will not be a new phenomenon if we fought ourselves into sanity. The English carried on

internecine warfare for twenty-one years, before they settled down to peaceful work. The French fought among themselves with a savage ferocity hardly excelled during recent times. The Americans did nothing better before they evolved their commonwealth. Let us not hug our unmanliness for fear of fighting amongst ourselves. The able writer of the notes loves unity as much as any of us and suggests that there must be 'a root and branch change, a radical transformation and reconstruction from the foundation.' But he leaves the reader to guess the remedy. It would have been better if he had made concrete suggestions. He would evidently have us intermarry and inter-dine if only by way of a beginning. If that is the radical transformation desired by him and if it is a condition precedent to the attainment of Swaraj, I very much fear that we would have to wait at least for a century. It is tantamount to asking Hindus to give up their religion. I do not say that it is wrong to do so, but I do suggest that it is reformation outside practical politics. And when that transformation comes, if it is ever to come, it will not be Hindu-Muslim unity. And what the present movement is aiming at is to achieve unity even whilst a devout Mussalman retains his faith intact and a devout Hindu his. I have therefore often said to my audiences that the Ali Brothers and I serve as an object lesson to all Hindus and Mussalmans in Hindu-Muslim unity. We both claim to be devoted to our respective faiths. In spite of the greatest regard for the Brothers, I would not give my daughter in marriage to one of their sons, and I know that they would not give theirs to my son, assuming that in spite of

his being a Hindu, he so far reformed himself as to covet the hand of their daughter. I do not partake of their meat foods, and they scrupulously respect my bigotry, if my self-denial may be so named. And yet I do not know three persons whose hearts are more united than those of the Ali Brothers and myself. And I wish to assure the reader that the unity is not a camouflage but it is a lasting friendship based upon exquisitely delicate regard and toleration of one another's views and habits. And I have no manner of fear that when the protecting hand of the British is withdrawn from me, either the Brothers or their friends would violate my freedom or attack my religion. And I base this security from fear first upon God and His promise of safety to every creature of His who endeavours to walk in His fear, and then upon the honourable conduct of the Brothers and their friends although I am aware that physically any one of them is more than a match for twelve like me put together. And so from the particular instance I have generalised for the whole of India, and shown that Hindu-Muslim unity is possible if only we have mutual toleration, and faith in ourselves and therefore in the ultimate goodness of human nature.

HINDU-MAHOMEDAN UNITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 25, 1920.)

Mr. Candler some time ago asked me in an imaginary interview whether if I was sincere in my professions of Hindu-Mahomedan unity, I would eat and drink with a

Mahomedan and give my daughter in marriage to a Mahomedan. This question has been asked again by some friends in another form. Is it necessary for Hindu-Mahomedan unity that there should be inter-dining and inter-marrying? The questioners say that if the two are necessary, real unity can never take place because crores of *Sanatanis* would never reconcile themselves to inter-dining, much less to inter-marriage.

I am one of those who do not consider caste to be a harmful institution. In its origin caste was a wholesome custom and promoted national well-being. In my opinion the idea that inter-dining or inter-marrying is necessary for national growth, is a superstition borrowed from the West. Eating is a process just as vital as the other sanitary necessities of life. And if mankind had not, much to its harm, made of eating a fetish and indulgence, we would have performed the operation of eating in private even as one performs the other necessary functions of life in private. Indeed the highest culture in Hinduism regards eating in that light and there are thousands of Hindus still living who will not eat their food in the presence of anybody. I can recall the names of several cultured men and women who ate their food in entire privacy but who never had any ill-will against any body and who lived on the friendliest terms with all.

and on marriage. The greater the restraint we exercise with regard to our appetites whether about eating or marrying, the better we become from a religious standpoint. I should despair of ever cultivating amicable relations with the world, if I had to recognise the right or the propriety of any young man offering his hand in marriage to my daughter or to regard it as necessary for me to dine with anybody and everybody. I claim that I am living on terms of friendliness with the whole world, I have never quarrelled with a single Mahomedan or Christian, but for years I have taken nothing but fruit in Mahomedan or Christian households. I would most certainly decline to eat cooked food from the same plate with my son or to drink water out of a cup which his lips have touched and which has not been washed. But the restraint or the exclusiveness exercised in these matters by me has never affected the closest companionship with the Mahomedan or the Christian friends or my sons.

But inter-dining and inter-marriage have never been a bar to disunion, quarrels and worse. The Pandavas and the Kauravas flew at one another's throats without compunction although they inter-dined and inter-married. The bitterness between the English and the Germans has not yet died out.

The fact is that inter-marriage and inter-dining are not necessary factors in friendship and unity though they are often emblems thereof. But insistence on either the one or the other can easily become and is to-day a bar to Hindu-Mahomedan unity. If we make ourselves believe that Hindus and Mahomedans cannot be one unless they inter-dine or inter-marry, we would be creating an artificial

And mutual toleration is a necessity for all time and for all races. We cannot live in peace if the Hindu will not tolerate the Mahomedan form of worship^d of God and his manners and customs or if the Mahomedans will be impatient of Hindu idolatory or cow-worship. It is not necessary for toleration that I must approve of what I tolerate. I heartily dislike drinking, meat eating and smoking. But I tolerate all these in Hindus, Mahomedans and Christians even as I expect them to tolerate my abstinence from all these although they may dislike it. All the quarrels between the Hindus and the Mahomedans have arisen from each wanting to *force* the other to his view.

COW PROTECTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 4, 1920.)

Cow protection is an article of faith in Hinduism. Apart from its religious sanctity, it is an ennobling creed. But we, Hindus, have to-day little regard for the cow and her progeny. In no country in the world are cattle so ill-fed and ill-kept as in India. In beef-eating England it would be difficult to find cattle with bones sticking out of their flesh. Most of our *panjarapoles* are ill-managed and ill-kept. Instead of being a real blessing to the animal world, they are perhaps simply receiving depots

We say nothing to the English in India for whose sake hundreds of cows are slaughtered daily. Our Rajas do not hesitate to provide beef for their English guests. Our protection of the cow, therefore, extends to rescuing her from Mussalman hands. This reverse method of cow protection has led to endless feuds and bad blood between Hindus and Mussalmans. It has probably caused greater slaughter of cows than otherwise would have been the case if we had begun the propaganda in the right order. We should have commenced, as we ought now to commence, with ourselves and cover the land with useful propaganda leading to kindness in the treatment of cattle and scientific knowledge in the management of cattle farms, dairies and *panjarapoles*. We should devote our attention to propaganda among Englishmen in the shape of inducing them voluntarily to abandon beef, or, if they will not do so, at least be satisfied with imported beef. We should secure prohibition of export of cattle from India and we should adopt means of increasing and purifying our milk supply. I have not a shadow of doubt that if we proceed along these sane lines, we would secure voluntary Mussalman support, and when we have ceased to compel them to stop killing cows on their festival days, we would find that they have no occasion for insisting on killing them. Any show of force on our part must lead to retaliation and accerbation of feeling. We may not make Mussalmans or anybody respect our feelings, religious or otherwise, by force. We can really do so only by exciting their fellow-feeling.

Hence it is that I have declined, and I am sure quite wisely, to enter into any bargain on the Khi-

lafat question. I consider myself to be among the staunchest of Hindus. I am as eager to save the cow from the Mussalman's knife as any Hindu. But on that very account, I refuse to make my support of the Mussalman claim on the Khilafat conditional upon his saving the cow. The Mussalman is my neighbour. He is in distress. His grievance is legitimate and it is my bounden duty to help him to secure redress by every legitimate means in my power even to the extent of losing my life and property. That is the way I can win permanent friendship with Mussalmans. I refuse to suspect human nature. It will, is bound to, respond to any noble and friendly action. The nobility of the help will be rendered nugatory if it was rendered conditionally. That the result will be the saving of the cow is a certainty. But should it turn out to be otherwise, my view will not be affected in any manner whatsoever. The test of friendship is a spirit of love and sacrifice independent of expectation of any return.

But one observes a spirit of impatience on the part of the Hindus. In our eagerness to protect the cow we seek to legislate through Municipalities and get the resolutions passed by Mussalman meetings. I would urge my Hindu countrymen to be patient. Our Mussalman countrymen are themselves doing most handsomely in the matter. I remind the readers of Maulana Abdul Bari's declaration that he would not take any proffered aid unless he, a devout Mussalman, could see his way clear to asking his followers to protect the cow. He has been as good as his word. He has been unremittingly attempting to create a favourable atmosphere for receiving the doctrine of cow

protection on humanitarian and utilitarian grounds. Hakimjee Ajmal Khan as President of the Muslim League last year carried his resolution of abstention from cow killing on festival days in the teeth of opposition members. The Ali Brothers have stopped beef-eating in their household. We must feel deeply grateful to those noble-hearted Mussalmans for their unsolicited response. We must let them solve the difficult problem in their own way. My advice to my Hindu brethren is, 'simply help the Mussalmans in their sorrow in a generous and self-sacrificing spirit without counting the cost and you will automatically save the cow'. Islam is a noble faith. Trust it and its followers. We must hold it a crime for any Hindus to talk to them about cow protection or any other help in our religious matters whilst the Khilafat struggle is going on.

SAVE THE COW

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 8, 1921.*)

Professor Vaswani has unfurled the banner of the cow's freedom. The danger has come sooner than I had expected. I had hoped that it would come when India could regard it with equanimity. In my humble opinion, Professor Vaswani might have started the movement under better auspices. Any movement started by Hindus for protecting the cow, without whole-hearted Mussalman co-operation, is doomed to failure.

The Hindus' participation in the Khilafat is the greatest

and the best movement for cow protection. I have therefore called Khilafat our Kamadhuk.

The Mussalmans are striving their utmost to respect Hindu susceptibilities in this matter of life and death to the Hindu. The Muslim League under Hakimji Ajmal Khan's presidentship, carried a cow protection resolution at Amritsar, two years ago. Maulana Abdul Bari has written upon it. The Ali Brothers, for the sake of their Hindu countrymen, have given up the use of beef in their house. Mian Chhotani saved hundreds of cows in Bombay alone during the last Bakr-Id. We could not accuse our Mussalman countrymen of apathy in the matter.

The surest way of defeating our object is to rush Mussalmans. I do not know that Mussalman honour has ever been found wanting. With them as with every one, prejudices die hard. We have got enlightened Mussalman opinion with us. It must take time for it to react upon the Mussalman masses. The Hindus must therefore be patient.

There is nothing strange about all the Shikarpur Hindus having voted unanimously in favour of the prohibition of cow slaughter. Is there a Hindu who will not vote for it? The use of that unanimous opinion for bearing down Mussalman opposition is the way to stiffen it. The Hindu members must have known, must have ascertained, Mussalman feeling. And they should have refrained from going to a division, so long as the Mussalman opinion was against them.

Let us recognise that there is an interest actively working to keep us—Hindus and Mussalmans—divided. That very interest is quite capable of developing regard

for Hindu susceptibilities in this respect. I should beware of it, and distrust it. I strongly advise the Shikarpur friends to wait for their Mussalman brethren.

Let them by all means abstain from all meat, so that their Mussalman brethren may have other meat cheaper than beef. Let them consider it a shame to have a single cow or her progeny in distress, or undergoing ill-treatment at the hands of Hindus themselves. Let them develop their *Goshala* so as to make it a model dairy farm as well as a home for aged and infirm cattle. Let them breed the finest cattle in their *Goshala*. They will do real service to *Gomata*. Let the Shikarpuris one and all become true non-co-operators, and hasten the redress of the Khilafat wrong. I promise, they will save the cow, when they have done their utmost to save the Khilafat.

It must be an article of faith for every Hindu, that the cow can only be saved by Mussalman friendship. Let us recognise frankly that complete protection of the cow depends purely upon Mussalman goodwill. It is as impossible to bend the Mussalmans to our will, as it would be for them to bend us to theirs. We are evolving the doctrine of equal and free partnership. We are fighting Dyerism—the doctrine of frightfulness.

Cow protection is the dearest possession of the Hindu heart. It is the one concrete belief common to all Hindus. No one who does not believe in cow protection, can possibly be a Hindu. It is a noble belief. I endorse every word of what Professor Vaswani has said in praise of the cow. Cow worship means to me worship of innocence.

For me, the cow is the personification of innocence. Cow protection means the protection of the weak and the helpless. As Professor Vaswani truly remarks, cow protection means brotherhood between man and beast. It is a noble sentiment that must grow by patient toil and *tapasya*. It cannot be imposed upon any one. To carry cow protection at the point of the sword is a contradiction in terms. Rishis of old are said to have performed penance for the sake of the cow. Let us follow in the footsteps of the Rishis, and ourselves do penance, so that we may be pure enough to protect the cow and all that the doctrine means and implies.

THE WAY TO SAVE THE COW

(September 8, 1921.)

[In one of his speeches during his visit to Bihar, Mr. Gandhi spoke on the way to save the cow as follows —]

On the question of cow killing I say that with the Hindus it is their *dharma* to protect the cow. The Hindus have many differences amongst them as regards religious belief, and religious and social customs and practices ; but on the matter of the protection of the cow all Hindus are united. And I go so far as to say that the cow question is the central and common fact in Hinduism, which differentiates it from all other religions of the world. In India the need for the cow is very great. Not only do the people drink her milk, but her male offspring is used for cultivating the land. The Hindus reverence the cow as they reverence the Brahman. But the case is not so outside India. So there is no prohibition

in the religion of our Mussalman brothers against the slaughter of cows. And if a Mussalman brother slays a cow for instance during *Id*, on what ground can a Hindu raise his hand to strike him? Is he enjoined by the *Shastras* to kill a fellow man in order to save a cow? There is really no such injunction in the *Shastras*; but on the contrary it is against the *Shastras* to do so. No Hindu raises his hand against an English brother, because he eats beef; nor does he prevent thousands and thousands of cows being led to the slaughter-house for the use of Englishmen in India. What I mean to say is this; in order to save the cow you can only sacrifice your own life; you cannot take another's life, nor can you even cherish anger against him. My brother Maulana Mahomed Ali in one of his speeches to-day said one thing on this matter, which I realise as very true. He says that three-fourths of the responsibility for cow-slaughter in India lie with the Hindus; and the Mussalmans are guilty of only one-fourth. For the cows that are slain really come from Hindu custody. I have actually seen in Bombay ship-loads of cows being sent out from India for slaughter in other lands. It is the Hindus that do cow selling business, and not the Mussalmans. And my brother's suggestion that if an artificial price of say a hundred rupees for each cow could be set, cow slaughter will automatically diminish, seemed to me to be very practical. It all depends upon us. In Bombay one cow given for the Tilak Swaraj Fund was sold for five hundred rupees, and another for a higher sum. If the *Shradddha* of both the buyer and the seller is sufficiently roused, all this is quite easy and practicable. My submission to the

.

Hindus, therefore, is, that if you are really anxious to save the cow, do not quarrel with our Mussalman brothers, but live with them in peace. Do not try to force their hands. Give yourselves up wholly to their service in this hour of their sore need without asking for a return. I look upon the Khilafat problem for the Mussalmans in the same light as the cow problem for the Hindus. It is my firm belief, that the solution of one will automatically lead to the solution of the other. I do not say this in a spirit of bargain. If our offering of service to our Mussalman brethren be genuine and spontaneous, if we really sacrifice our lives for the safety of their religion, I have no doubt that another law higher than the law of contract will operate, and solve the cow problem in India.

LET HINDUS BEWARE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 18, 1921.)

Bihar is the land of promise for non-co-operation. For the Hindu-Muslim unity of Bihar is proverbial. I was therefore distressed to find that the unity was suffering a strain which might almost prove unbearable. I was told by all responsible leaders—both Hindu and Mahomedan—who are not given to be panicky—that it was taxing their resources to the utmost to avoid a Hindu-Mussalman disturbance. They informed me that certain Hindus, by name Gangaram Sharma, Bautanath and Vidyanand for instance, had told the people that I had prohibited the use of meat to any Hindus or Mussalmans and that meat

and fish were even forcibly taken away from people by over-zealous vegetarians. I know that unlawful use is being made of my name in many places, but this is the most novel method of misusing it. It is generally known that I am a staunch vegetarian and food reformer. But it is not equally generally known that *Ahimsa* extends as much to human beings as to lower animals and that I freely associate with meat-eaters.

I would not kill a human being for protecting a cow, as I will not kill a cow for saving a human life, be it ever so precious. Needless to say I have authorised no one to preach vegetarianism as part of non-co-operation. I do not know the persons named above. I am sure that our purpose will be defeated if propaganda of any kind is accompanied by violence. Hindus may not compel Mussalmans to abstain from meat or even beef eating. Vegetarian Hindus may not compel other Hindus to abstain from fish, flesh or fowl. I would not make India sober at the point of the sword. Nothing has lowered the morale of the nation so much as violence. Fear has become the part of the national character. Non-co-operators will make a serious mistake, if they seek to convert people to their creed by violence. They will play into the hands of the Government, if they use the slightest coercion towards anybody in the course of their propaganda.

The cow question is a big question. The greatest for a Hindu. I yield to no one in my regard for the cow. Hindus do not fulfil their trust so long as they do not possess the ability to protect the cow. That ability can be derived either from body-force or soul-force. To

attempt cow protection by violence is to reduce Hinduism to Satanism and to prostitute to a base end the grand significance of cow protection. As a Mussalman friend writes, beef-eating which is merely permissible in Islam will become a duty, if compulsion is resorted to by Hindus. The latter can protect the cow only by developing the faculty for dying, for suffering. The only chance Hindus have of saving the cow in India from the butcher's knife, is by trying to save Islam from the impending peril and trusting their Mussalman countrymen to return nobility, *i. e.*, voluntarily to protect the cow out of regard for their Hindu countrymen. The Hindus must scrupulously refrain from using any violence against Mussalmans. Suffering and trust are attributes of soul force. I have heard that at big fairs if a Mussalman is found in possession of cows or even goats, he is at times forcibly dispossessed. Those, who claiming to be Hindus thus resort to violence, are enemies of the cow and of Hinduism. The best and the only way to save the cow is to save the Khilafat. I hope therefore that every non-co-operator will strain himself to the utmost to prevent the slightest tendency to violence in any shape or form whether to protect the cow or any other animal or to effect any other purpose.

vii. National Unity

BRAHMINS AND NON-BRAHMINS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 17, 1920.)

When I wrote in *Young India* on the non-Brahmin question in Maharastra, * I little realised that the non-Brahmin case was largely, if not entirely, a political matter, and that the complaint was not so much against the Brahmins as a class by the non-Brahmins as a class, as by some educated non-Brahmins against the Nationalists who were mostly Brahmins. Non-Brahmins include the Lingayats, the Marathas, the Jains and the "untouchables." The latter, however, have a separate grievance against the other non-Brahmins, in that they are isolated as much by the non-Brahmins. The case for the educated non-Brahmins is again not common to all. It may however be stated in the following terms:—

(1) Educated non-Brahmins do not possess the same political power that the Brahmins possess.

The latter have the largest number of Government posts and seats on representative bodies, although the former are numerically by far the strongest.

(2) Some Brahmins debar the Lingayats from the inner sanctuary of Temples, which the latter claim as their own; and this false (in their estimation) claim is supported by the Brahmins in general.

* Not included in this collection.

(3) The Brahmins treat all non-Brahmins as Shudras, and treat them precisely as the British treat all Indians.

In my opinion the non-Brahmin case is exceedingly weak and is certain to disappear from the public life of Maharashtra, if the Brahmins of the nationalist party carry out the Congress non-co-operation programme in its entirety.

The movement owes its vitality, not to the religious or the social disability, but to the political ascendancy of the Brahmins, which the latter undoubtedly enjoy by right of merit. That grievance must vanish if the nationalist Brahmins, having evolved larger views about Swaraj, taboo all Government posts and boycott the councils and nominated seats on municipalities. It is clear to me that the Government in accordance with its confirmed policy will play the non-Brahmins against the Brahmins, even without the knowledge of the former and endeavour to prolong its lease of life by fostering quarrels between the two, and holding out political inducements to the non-Brahmins.

It is clear, too, that the Brahmins will take the wind out of the non-Brahmin sail, and make that opposition innocuous by a right renunciation of every form of Government patronage. The reason why the question has assumed a more acute form is that non-Brahmin leaders are trying to influence the electorate in their favour, and are telling the electors that the non-Brahmins being weak, they must seek the British alliance. Brahmin leaders are naturally trying to influence the same electors and dissuade them from using their vote. This gives rise to bad blood but not more than when the moderate and

the nationalists are fighting. The most painful part of the situation, however, is that the non-Brahmin leaders, who claim to represent the masses and to feel for them, will by their co-operation with the Government, or by seeking to better their condition by Government aid, will actually tighten the hold of the Government on the masses. And by their countenancing the Government aid they will make more difficult the remedy of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs. The non-Brahmin policy is thus demonstrably suicidal. Whatever their grievance against the Brahmins or the Nationalists, their remedy certainly does not lie through alliance with a Government, whose creed is economic exploitation of the masses, and to that end also their emasculation. For this refusal to right the Punjab, and partly even the Khilafat wrong, is based upon the policy of keeping up the British prestige at any cost. One lac of Englishmen cannot keep under subjection thirty crores of human beings merely by brute force.

But it can, and does, consolidate its power, by making them progressively helpless, in a most subtle manner. I venture therefore to warn the non-Brahmin leaders against the danger of co-operation with the Government which is bound to hurt the very cause which they seek to espouse. They will not better the economic condition of the masses by gaining a few Government posts, or by being elected legislative councillors.

Judged by the economic standard, thirty-five years of our political activity have resulted in disaster. The masses of India to-day are less able to stand the ravages of famine and disease than they were fifty years ago.

They are less manly than they were at any period in the history of the nation.

The impending calamity of the non-Brahmin leaders running into the arms of the Government for the supposed betterment of their political condition can easily be averred by the great Brahmin party. It is intelligent, it is strong, it has the traditional prestige of authority. It can afford to stoop to conquer. A whole hearted acceptance of the non-co-operation programme does provide an automatic solution. But it is not enough.

Bitterness will still remain, unless the Brahmins extend the hand of fellowship to those who feel weak and injured. Complaints were made about nationalist papers in the Karnatik using offensive and haughty language towards non-Brahmins; of nationalist Brahmins otherwise also belittling them and treating them with contempt. Their ignorant non-Brahmin countrymen have a right to expect courtesy and considerateness from comparatively more enlightened Brahmins. The mass of non-Brahmins are still untouched by the anti-Brahmin prejudice. I have faith enough in the Maharashtra Brahmin to know that he will solve the non-Brahmin question in a manner befitting the traditions of Hinduism of which he is a trustee.*

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of October 27, 1920 —

Closely allied to this question (of untouchability) is the non-Brahmin question. I wish I had studied it more closely than I have been able to. A quotation from my speech delivered at a private meeting in Madras has been torn from its context and misused to further the antagonism between the so-called Brahmins and the so-called non-Brahmins. I do not wish to retract a word of what I said at that meeting. I was appealing to those who are accepted as Brahmins. I told them that in my opinion the treatment of non-Brahmins by the Brahmins was as satanic as the treatment of us by the British. I added that the non Brahmins should be placated

THE CASTE SYSTEM

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 8, 1920.)

I have received several angry letters about my remarks during my Deccan tour on the caste system. I am not publishing these letters, because there is nothing but vituperation in them, and when there is no vituperation, there is little argument about them. I am anxious to open the columns of *Young India* to opinions expressing dissent from its views, but the writers must be brief and interesting. Acrimony is no argument. I am obliged to make these remarks, because two writers at least would have gained publicity for their letters, if they had not been prolix and unintelligible in their expression. The question, however, that my correspondents have raised, commands attention and deserves an answer. They argue that the retention of the caste system spells ruin for India and that it is caste which has reduced India to slavery. In my opinion, it is not

without any ado or bargaining. But my remarks were never intended to encourage the powerful non-Brahmins of Maharashtra or Madras, or the mischievous element among them, to overawe the so-called Brahmins. I use the word 'so-called' advisedly. For the Brahmins who have freed themselves from the thralldom of superstitious orthodoxy have not only no quarrel with non-Brahmins as such, but are in every way eager to advance non-Brahmins wherever they are weak. No lover of his country can possibly achieve its general advance if he dared to neglect the least of his countrymen. Those non-Brahmins therefore who are coquetting with the Government are selling themselves and the nation to which they belong. By all means let those who have faith in the Government help to sustain it, but let no Indian worthy of his birth cut off his nose to spite the face.

caste that has made us what we are. It was our greed and disregard of essential virtues which enslaved us. I believe that caste has saved Hinduism from disintegration.

But like every other institution, it has suffered from excrescences. I consider the four divisions alone to be fundamental, natural, and essential. The innumerable sub-castes are sometimes a convenience, often a hindrance. The sooner there is fusion the better. The silent destruction and reconstruction to sub-castes have ever gone on and are bound to continue. Social pressure and public opinion can be trusted to deal with the problem. But I am certainly against any attempt at destroying the fundamental divisions. The caste system is not based on inequality, there is no question of inferiority, and so far as there is any such question arising as in Madras, Maharashtra, or elsewhere, the tendency should undoubtedly be checked. But there appears to be no valid reason for ending the system because of its abuse. It lends itself easily to reformation. The spirit of democracy, which is fast spreading throughout India and the rest of the world, will, without a shadow of doubt, purge the institution of the idea of predominance and subordination.

The spirit of democracy is not a mechanical thing to be adjusted by abolition of forms. It requires change of the heart. If caste is a bar to the spread of the spirit, the existence of five religions in India—Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Zoroastrianism, and Judaism—is equally a bar. The spirit of democracy requires the inculcation of the spirit of brotherhood, and I can find no difficulty in

considering a Christian or a Mahomedan to be my brother in absolutely the same sense as a blood brother, and Hinduism that is responsible for the doctrine of the caste is also responsible for the inculcation of the essential brotherhood, not merely of man but even of all that lives.

One of my correspondents suggests that we should abolish the caste but adopt the class system of Europe *—meaning thereby I suppose that the idea of heredity in caste should be rejected. I am inclined to think that the law of heredity is an eternal law and any attempt to alter that law must lead, as it has before led, to utter confusion. I can see very great use in considering a Brahmin to be always a Brahmin throughout his life. If he does not behave himself like a Brahmin,† he will naturally cease to command the respect that is due to the real Brahmin. It is easy to imagine the innumerable difficulties if one were to set up a court of punishments and rewards, degradation and promotion. If Hindus believe, as they must believe in reincarnation, transmigration, they must know that nature will, without any possibility of mistake, adjust the balance by degrading a Brahmin, if he misbehaves himself, by reincarnating him in a lower division, and translating one who lives the life of a Brahmin in his present incarnation to Brahminhood in his next.

Inter-drinking, inter-dining, inter-marrying, I hold, are not essential for the promotion of the spirit of democracy.

* See page 117.

† Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of November 17, 1921.—

Prejudice and Insolence.—A correspondent from the Tanjore District writes saying that he and his brother though Brahmins felt that rather than lead a lazy life, they should do some work and they 'turned their

I do not contemplate under a most democratic constitution a universality of manners and customs about eating, drinking and marrying. We shall ever have to seek unity in diversity, and I decline to consider it a sin for a man not to drink or eat with any and everybody. In Hinduism, children of brothers may not intermarry. The prohibition does not interfere with cordiality of relations, probably it promotes healthiness of relationships. In Vaishnava households, I have known mothers not dining in the common kitchen, nor drinking from the same pot, without their becoming exclusive, arrogant, or less loving. These are disciplinary restraints which are not in themselves bad. Carried to ridiculous extremes, they may

hands to the plough.' So they began agriculture. Thereupon their fellow villagers became disgusted and excommunicated them. They however remained firm in their resolve. When the Sankaracharya of Kumbakonam visited their part of the district, they went with their offering which was rejected, because they had committed the sin of labouring for their livelihood. My correspondent tells me he is not at all put out by the Sankaracharya's action. I congratulate the brothers on their public spirit. Excommunication from a tyrannical society is indeed a reward of merit and should be welcomed. To say that a Brahman should not touch the plough is a parody of Varnashrama and a prostitution of the meaning of the Bhagavad Gita. Surely the qualities predominantly ascribed to the different divisions are not denied to the others. Is bravery to be the prerogative only of the Kshatriya and restraint only of the Brahman? Are Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Sudras to protect the cow? Can any one remain a Hindu without readiness to die for the cow? Yet strangely enough, I have a letter from the Madras Presidency seriously telling me that cow protection has nothing to do with any but the Vaishyas. When there is so much ignorance combined with insolence, the best thing to do is to incur all risks and pursue the path of reform expecting time to prove the truth of one's position. If we combine love with firmness, we shall disarm all opposition in the end. Reformers may neither relent nor become angry.

become harmful, and if the motive is one of arrogation of superiority, the restraint becomes an indulgence, therefore, hurtful. But as time goes forward, and new necessities and occasions arise, the custom regarding inter-drinking, inter-dining and inter-marrying, will require cautious modifications or rearrangement.

Thus, whilst I am prepared to defend, as I have always done, the division of Hindus into four castes, as I have so often said in these columns, I consider untouchability to be a heinous crime against humanity. It is not a sign of self-restraint but an arrogant assumption of superiority. It has served no useful purpose and it has suppressed, as nothing else in Hinduism has, vast numbers of the human race who are not only every bit as good as ourselves, but are rendering in many walks of life an essential service to the country. It is a sin of which the sooner Hinduism purges itself the better it is for itself, if it is to be recognised as an honourable and elevating religion. I know no argument in favour of its retention and I have no hesitation in rejecting scriptural authority of a doubtful character in order to support a sinful institution. Indeed I would reject all authority if it is in conflict with sober reason or the dictates of the heart. Authority sustains and ennobles the weak when it is the handwork of reason, but it degrades them when it supplants reason sanctified by the still small voice within.

CASTE *vs.* CLASS

(December 29, 1920.)

Man being a social being has to devise some method of social organisation. We in India have evolved caste; they in Europe have organised class. Neither has the solidarity and naturalness of a family which perhaps is a God-ordained institution. If caste has produced certain evils, class has not been productive of anything less. As Swami Vivekananda once put it, "here the child-widow sheds her tears in secrecy—there forced maidenhood sends its sighs to heaven" All the arguments of the Socialists and the Communists go to prove that class is neither a natural nor a healthy arrangement of society.

If class helps to conserve certain social virtues, caste does the same in equal, if not greater degree. The beauty of the caste system is that it does not base itself upon distinctions of wealth, possessions. Money, as history has proved, is the greatest disruptive force in the world. Even the sacredness of family ties is not safe against the pollution of wealth,—says Shankaracharya. Caste is but an extension of the principle of the family. Both are governed by blood and heredity. Western scientists are busy trying to prove that heredity is an illusion and that *milieu* is everything. The solid experience of many lands goes against the conclusion of these scientists; but even accepting their doctrine of *milieu*, it is easy to prove that *milieu* can be conserved and developed more through caste than through class. The Anglo-Saxon is temperamentally incapable of appreciating any outlook but his own. One can under-

stand his violent opposition to everything that goes against his grain. But Indians, whether Hindus or Christians, ought to be able to see that the spirit behind caste is not one of arrogant superiority; it is the classification of different systems of self-culture. It is the best possible adjustment of social stability and progress. Just as the spirit of the family is inclusive of those who love each other and are wedded to each other by ties of blood and relation, caste also tries to include families of a particular way of purity of life (not standard of life, meaning by this term, economic standard of life). Only it does not leave the decision, whether a particular family belongs to a particular type, to the idiosyncracies or interested judgment of a few individuals. It trusts to the principle of heredity, and being only a system of culture does not hold that any injustice is done if an individual or a family has to remain in a particular group in spite of their decision to change their mode of life for the better. As we all know, change comes very slowly in social life, and thus, as a matter of fact, caste has allowed new groupings to suit the changes in lives. But these changes are as quiet and easy as a change in the shapes of the clouds. It is difficult to imagine a better harmonious human adjustment.

Caste does not connote superiority or inferiority. It simply recognises different outlooks and corresponding modes of life. But it is no use denying the fact that a sort of hierarchy has been evolved in the caste system, but it cannot be called the creation of the Brahmins. When all castes accept a common goal of life, a hierarchy is inevitable, because all castes cannot realize the ideal in

equal degree. If all the castes believe that vegetarian diet is superior to animal diet, the vegetarian caste will naturally be looked up to. There are certain sub-castes in India that have ever stood on a par with each other, and yet have not inter-dined or inter-married. Just as a Hindu or a Mahomedan does not think himself an inferior of the other because of his difference of faith, or just as a Brahmin or a Lingayat in Southern India mutually refuse to inter-drink, all castes can confine their food and drink to their own caste. Only by accepting the standard of the Brahmins or the *Vaishnavas* as the best, have the other castes consented to dine at the hands of the "purer" castes.

. Touch, drink, food and marriage are progressively private affairs. By refusing to touch a man, you practically refuse all intercourse with him. He is thus denied all the fruits of social development. The touchables, for instance, can all attend the *Kathhas*, the *Kirtans* (religious sermons). They can enter temples and thus get the *free* education of religion, rituals and arts. In the temple, all the touchables exchange their love and service, and the fruits of civilisation. The "untouchables" are automatically barred from all that. In many places, being required to live outside the village, they are deprived of even the protection of their life and property. In the social division of labour they do the utmost and one of the most important duties to society, and they are deprived of the fruits of the great social life which is evolved by the family of castes. ✓ Untouchability has made the "depressed" classes, the Cinderella of Hindu society. The question of food and drink has or ought to have no social

value. It is merely the satisfaction of physical wants. It is, on the other hand, an opportunity for the control of the senses. Inter-dining has never been known to promote brotherhood in any special sense. But the restraints about inter-dining have to a great extent helped the cultivation of will-power and conservation of certain social virtues.

TO THE PARSIS

(March 23, 1921.)

Dear Friends,

I know that you are following with considerable interest the present non-co-operation movement. You may know, too, that all thoughtful non-co-operators are anxiously waiting to see what part you are going to play in the process of purification through which the whole country is passing. I, personally, have every reason to have full faith in your doing the right thing when the moment for making the final choice comes to you. And I address these few words to you because I feel that, probably, that moment has now arrived.

Apart from your being fellow-countrymen, I am bound to you by many sacred ties. Dadabhai was the first patriot to inspire me. He was my guide and helper when I did not know any other leader. It was to him that I bore, when yet a boy, a letter of introduction. It was the late uncrowned king of Bombay who led me in 1896 and showed me the way to work. It was he who, when I wanted to give battle to a Political Agent as far back as 1892, restrained my youthful ardour and taught me the

first lesson in Ahimsa in public life. He taught me not to resent personal wrongs if I would serve India. A Parsi merchant in Durban, Rustamjee Ghorkhodoo, was among my most valued clients and friends in South Africa. He gave freely to the public cause, and he and his brave son were the first among my fellow-prisoners.

He gave me shelter when I was lynched, and now, too, he is following the Swaraj movement with considerable interest and has just donated Rs. 40,000 to it. In my humble opinion, probably the first woman in India to-day is a Parsi woman—gentle as a lamb, with a heart that holds the whole humanity. To have her friendship is the rarest privilege of life. I would love to multiply these sacred memories, but I have given you enough of them to enable you to understand and to appreciate the motive of this letter.

You are a very cautious community. You are compact, and you rightly insist on abundant proof of the stability and the morality of any movement before you would take to it. But there is no danger of your becoming over-cautious, and your success in trade may make you oblivious of the wants and aspirations of the multitude of your countrymen.

I dread the Rockefeller spirit that seems to be overtaking the great House of the Tatas. I dread to think of the consequences of their appropriating poor people's properties for the doubtful benefit of making India industrial.*

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of April 27, 1921 :—

SATYAGRAH IN MULSHI.

My heart goes out to these poor people. I wish the great house of Tatas, instead of standing on their legal rights, will reason with the people

But I do believe that this is a passing phase. Your shrewdness will show you the suicidal nature of such enterprises. Your quick wit will tell you that what India needs is not concentration of capital in a few hands, but its distribution so as to be within easy reach of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of villages that make this continent 1,900 miles long and 1,500 miles broad. I know, therefore, it is a question of time when you will throw in your lot as a community with the reformers who are hungering to free India from the curse of an imperialism which is bleeding her to death.

But there is one thing for which it will be criminal to wait. A temperance wave is passing over India. The people want voluntarily to become teetotalers. Society

themselves, and do whatever they wish in consultation with them. I have some experience of Land Acquisition Acts. I had nearly eighty cases to deal with. Here the reason for the acquisition was not industrial development but insanitation. I know that the people dispossessed never got the exact equivalent. What is the value of all boons that the Tata scheme claims to confer upon India, if it is to be at the unwilling expense of even one poor man? I dare say the problem of disease and poverty can be easily solved, and the survivors will live in luxury if the three crore half-starved men and women, and lakhs of the decrepit humanity were shot and their bodies utilized for manure, or their bones utilized for making knife-handles. And yet no one but a lunatic will put up such a suggestion. Is the case any weaker when men and women are not to be shot, but compulsorily dispossessed of their valued lands about which sentiment, romance, and all that makes life worth living, have grown up? I suggest to the custodians of the great name that they would more truly advance India's interest if they will defer to the wishes of their weak and helpless countrymen. The duty of the *Satyagrahis* is written in letters of gold. There can be no *Satyagrah* in an unjust cause. *Satyagrah* in a just cause is vain, if the men espousing it are not determined and capable of fighting and suffering to the end; and the slightest use of violence often defeats a just cause. *Satyagrah* excludes the use of violence in any shape or form, whether in thought, speech, or deed. Given a just cause, capacity for endless suffering, and avoidance of violence, victory is a certainty.

fast developing a public opinion that would consider drinking an unpardonable vice. Many Parsis make a living by running liquor shops. Your whole-hearted co-operation can sweep out of existence many of these plague-spots in the Bombay Presidency. The Local Governments almost all over India are making a dis-creditable attempt to thwart the movement which bids fair to succeed even to the point of destroying the whole of the Abkari revenue. Will you help the Government or the people? The Bombay Government has not yet been seized by panic. But I can hardly imagine that it will have the courage and wisdom to sacrifice the drink revenue. You have to make your immediate choice. I do not know what your Scriptures say about drink. I can guess what the Prophet, who separated good from evil and sang the victory of the former over the latter, is likely to have said. But apart from your own religious belief, you have to make up your mind as to whether you will forward the cause of temperance in a whole-hearted manner or whether you will supinely and philosophically watch developments. I shall hope that you as a practical community of India will actively and thoroughly associate yourselves with the great temperance movement which bids fair to outshine every such movement in the world.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. GANDHI.

WHAT SHOULD PARSIS DO ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 22, 1921.)

‘Observer’ in the *Times of India* asks :—

“Are the Parsis to ask their children to leave Government and aided schools, when no provision is made for National Schools adapted to meet the special requirements of the Parsis? Are the Parsi lawyers to boycott law-courts, and starve their families? Are the Parsis to give up their lucrative vocations, and devote themselves to spinning yarn, for three annas a day? The three annas per day will not suffice to pay their daily bill for soda water, let alone whisky and soda. Or, should the Parsis give up their present dress, which is more European than Asiatic, and go back to the days of their ancestors, who used to put on pyjamas with legs wide enough to carry a dozen fowl? Is it possible, thus to set back the hand of time? Will Mr. Gandhi be so good as to give a convincing reply to these queries?”

Parsis are the pioneers in matters educational. They need not withdraw a single child from the present schools. They need only to rid themselves of the infatuation for degrees, and they can to-day disaffiliate all their schools. They have money enough to pay for their special education. Parsi lawyers, if they boycott law courts, are, I know, resourceful enough to turn their attention to commerce, which is a speciality with the Parsis, if indeed they will not care to join the national service. They and the nation will be the better for the

able Parsi lawyers' renunciation. No one, certainly no Parsi is expected to give up any lucrative calling not calculated to uphold the prestige of this Government, and to take up spinning instead. But every Parsi with leisure is expected to devote his or her leisure hours to spinning for the sake of the nation. Thus, there is no question of the Parsis giving up their soda. But those who take intoxicating drinks, will benefit themselves and the nation by total abstinence. Parsis need not give up their present style of dress, so long as the cloth is hand spun and hand woven. But they will lose nothing by reverting to the ancient simplicity of their forefathers. The old Parsi dress was designed to fit the Indian climate. The European style is ugly and utterly unsuitable for Indian conditions. Only their insularity and unimaginativeness have made the English retain their English style in India, even though they admit that it is most uncomfortable for this climate. I venture to think that thoughtless imitation is no sign of progress. Nor is every reversion to old habits tantamount to 'setting back the hand of time.' Retracing a hasty or erroneous step is surely a sign of progress. And it is contended, that during the past hundred years, we have taken many a faulty step. Before, therefore, we can move forward, we must go many steps back to find ourselves on the right track. We lost the way, and I invite 'Observer', and all other Parsis to hasten back to the point, where we strayed from the right path.

CHRISTIANS AND NON-CO-OPERATION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 15, 1921.)

An Indian Christian from Basrah, North, writes:—

“I am sorry to say that you do not take us Indian Christians as the people of India, as I have seen many times *Young India* mentioning Mussalmans, Hindus, Sikhs, etc., but omitting the Christians. I should like you to believe that we, Indian Christians, are also the people of India, and take much interest in India's own affairs.

“I am sure there are very few who have followed N. C. O. as Indian Christians have. I have much sympathy for my motherland's affairs. I am also a follower of N. C. O.

“I promise to give some news about the state of Indians in Mesopotamia now and then.”

I assure the correspondent and other Indian Christians that non-co-operation is no respecter of creeds or races. It invites and admits all to its fold. Many Indian Christians have contributed to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. There are some noted Indian Christians as non-co operators in the front rank. There is constant mention of Mussalmans and Hindus, as they have hitherto regarded one another as enemies. Similarly, there always has been some cause when any race has been specially mentioned in these columns.

(September 22, 1921.)

A Christian student writes:—“Though we are Christian students, you are our national leader, and we feel that we ought to learn from you what India stands for and what is

her spiritual heritage. Will you therefore send me your criticism of Western Christianity with constructive suggestions regarding organisation, worship and ministry?"

My inquirer did not know that he was taking me beyond my depth. It is a pleasure to me, however, that Indian Christians are taking growing interest in the national movement. I know that hundreds of poor Christians in Bombay paid what they could to the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund. I know that several educated Christians are devoting their splendid talents to national work. I propose, therefore, to satisfy my inquirer,—not in the way he would have me to—but in the only way I can.

India of the near future stands for perfect toleration of all religions. Her spiritual heritage is simple living and high thinking. I consider Western Christianity in its practical working a negation of Christ's Christianity. I cannot conceive Jesus, if he was living in the flesh in our midst, approving of modern Christian organisations, public worship or modern ministry. If Indian Christians will simply cling to the Sermon on the Mount, which was delivered not merely to the peaceful disciples but a groaning world, they would not go wrong, and they would find that no religion is false, and that if all live according to their lights and in the fear of God, they would not need to worry about organisations, forms of worship and ministry. The Pharisees had all that, but Jesus would have none of it, for they were using their office as a cloak for hypocrisy and worse. Co-operation with forces of good and non-co-operation with forces of evil are the two things we need for good and pure life, whether it is called Hindu, Muslim or Christian.

THE NATIONAL FLAG

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 13, 1921.)

A flag is a necessity for all nations. Millions have died for it. It is no doubt a kind of idolatry which it would be a sin to destroy. For a flag represents an ideal. The unfurling of the Union Jack evokes in the English breast sentiments whose strength it is difficult to measure. The Stars and Stripes mean a world to the Americans. The Star and the Crescent will call forth the best bravery in Islam.

It will be necessary for us Indians—Hindus, Mahomedans, Christians, Jews, Parsis, and all others to whom India is their home—to recognise a common flag to live and to die for.

Mr. P. Venkayya of the National College, Masulipatam, has for some years placed before the public a suggestive booklet describing the flags of the other nations and offering designs for an Indian national flag. But, whilst I have always admired the persistent zeal with which Mr. Venkayya has prosecuted the cause of a national flag at every session of the Congress for the past four years, he was never able to enthuse me; and in his designs I saw nothing to stir the nation to its depths. It was reserved for a Punjabee to make a suggestion that at once arrested attention. ✓ It was Lala Hansraj of Jullunder who, in discussing the possibilities of the spinning wheel, suggested that it should find a place on our Swaraj flag. I could not help admiring.

the originality of the suggestion. At Bezwada I asked Mr. Venkayya to give me a design containing a spinning wheel on a red (Hindu colour) and green (Muslim colour) background. His enthusiastic spirit enabled me to possess a flag in three hours. It was a just a little late for presentation to the All-India Congress Committee. I am glad it was so. On maturer consideration I saw that the background should represent the other religions also. Hindu-Muslim unity is not an exclusive term; it is an inclusive term, symbolic of the unity of all faith domiciled in India. If Hindus and Muslims can tolerate each other, they are together bound to tolerate all other faiths. The unity is not a menace to the other faiths represented in India or to the world. So I suggest that the background should be white and green and red. The white* portion is intended to represent all other faiths.

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of May 18, 1921 —

Sikh Colour—A friend has just drawn my attention to a resolution passed by the Sikh League inviting me to include the Sikh black colour in the national flag. These friends forget that all other colours are represented on the white strip. We must not be parochial, provincial or clanish. Hindu and Mussalman colours are specially represented, not so much for the numbers they represent, as for the fact that they have remained apart for so long and that their mutual distrust has been an effectual bar against the realization of national aspirations. The Sikhs have never had any quarrel with Hindus. And if one has the Sikh colour separately represented, why not the Parsee, the Christian and the Jewish? I hope the Sikh Leaguers will see the unpractical nature of their suggestion.)

I have been flooded with letters suggesting changes in the proposed national flag. I am unable to publish the voluminous correspondence. There is nothing striking in any of the letters. Some deplore the want of artistic beauty about the flag, others would make additions representing Hindu and Muhammedan symbols. The critics have missed the central idea. We must not have any religious symbols and we must find a clear and

The weakest numerically occupy the first place, the Islamic colour comes next, the Hindu colour red comes last, the idea being that the strongest should act as a shield to the weakest. The white colour moreover represents purity and peace. Our national flag must mean that or nothing And to represent equality of the least of

permanent rallying object. ✓ That is the spinning wheel, according to the vast majority who believe with me that we lost our liberty with the loss of the spinning wheel, and we can only regain it when we have revived the spinning wheel and rejected foreign cloth '.

Again he wrote on August 4, 1921 .—

The Sikh friends are needlessly agitated over the colours in the proposed national flag. They want the black colour also to be inserted on the ground of their military importance. Apart from the merits, their agitation has no point, as the flag has not even come before the All-India Congress Committee for discussion or decision. And in view of their objection I do not propose to bring it up before the Committee at all, so long as I have failed to convince them of the unreasonableness of the demand. On the merits, I have not the shadow of a doubt that they should withdraw the objection. ✓ The white includes all other colours. To ask for special prominence is tantamount to a refusal to merge in the two numerically great communities. I would have had only one colour if there had been no quarrel between Hindus and Mussalmans. The Sikhs never had any difference with the Hindus. And their quarrel with the Mussalmans was of the same type as the Hindus. It is a dangerous thing to emphasise our differences or distinctions. We must seek for points of contact. ✓ Distinguished Mussalman friends on hearing of the Sikh claim advised me to adopt a single colour, either white or red. But that too would be inadvisable. The two colours, red and green, should be there to perpetuate the growing unity. I am aware of the difficulty of Sikh nationalists. The Government agents in the Sikh camp are making all kinds of mischievous suggestions to breed dissensions. And they are naturally afraid. The best thing is not to worry. If they attempt to set right every grievance manufactured against Hindus or Mussalmans or against the non-co operation movement in general, they will find that they will have no platform to stand upon. Whether they are few or many, Sikh nationalists must know their own mind and stand unmoved by anything said by their detractors.

us with the best, an equal part is assigned to all the three colours in the design.

But India as a nation can live and die only for the spinning wheel. Every woman will tell the curious that with the disappearance of the spinning wheel, vanished India's happiness and prosperity. The womanhood and the masses of India have been awakened as never before at the call of the spinning wheel. The masses recognise in it the giver of life. The women regard it as the protector of their chastity. Every widow I have met has recognised in the wheel a dear forgotten friend. Its restoration alone can fill the millions of hungry mouths. No industrial development schemes can solve the problem of the growing poverty of the peasantry of India covering a vast surface, 1900 miles long and 1500 broad. India is not a small island, it is a big continent which cannot be converted like England into an industrial country. And we must resolutely set our face against any scheme of exploitation of the world. Our only hope must centre upon utilising the wasted hours of the nation, for adding to the wealth of the country, by converting cotton into cloth in our cottages. The spinning wheel is, therefore, as much a necessity of Indian life as air and water.

Moreover, the Muslims swear by it just as much as the Hindus. As a matter of fact, the former are taking to it more readily than the Hindus. For the Muslim woman is *pardanashin* and she can now add a few *paisas* to the poor resources that her husband brings to the family. The spinning wheel, therefore, is the most natural, as it is the most important, common factor of national life. Through it we inform the whole world that we are

determined, so far as our food and clothing are concerned, to be totally independent of the rest of it. Those who believe with me will make haste to introduce the spinning wheel in their home and possess a national flag of the design suggested by me.

It follows that the flag must be made of *khaddar*, for it is through coarse cloth alone that we can make India independent of foreign markets for her cloth. I would advise all religious organisations, if they agree with my argument, to weave into their religious flags, as for instance the Khilafat, a miniature National Flag in the upper left-hand corner. The regulation size of the Flag should contain the drawing of a full-sized spinning wheel.

THREE NATIONAL CRIES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 8, 1920.)

During the Madras tour, at Bezwada, I had occasion to remark upon the national cries and I suggested that it would be better to have cries about ideals than men. I asked the audience to replace *Mahatma Gandhiki Jai* and *Mahomed Ali-Shaukat Aliki Jai* by *Hindu-Mussalmanki Jai*. Brother Shaukat Ali, who followed, positively laid down the law. In spite of the Hindu-Muslim unity, he had observed that, if Hindus shouted *Bande Mataram*, the Muslims rang out with *Allaho Akbar* and vice versa. This, he rightly said, jarred on the ear and still showed that the people did not act with one mind. There should be therefore only three cries recognised,

Allaho Akbar to be joyously sung out by Hindus and Muslims showing that God alone was great and no other. The second should be *Bande Mataram* (Hail Motherland) or *Bharat Mataki Jai* (Victory to Mother Hind). The third should be *Hindu-Mussalmanki Jai*, without which there was no victory for India, and no true demonstration of the greatness of God. I do wish that the newspapers and public men would take up the Maulana's suggestion and lead the people only to use the three cries. They are full of meaning. The first is a prayer and a confession of our littleness and therefore a sign of humility. It is a cry in which all Hindus and Muslims should join in reverence and prayerfulness. Hindus may not fight shy of Arabic words, when their meaning is not only totally inoffensive but even ennobling. God is no respecter of any particular tongue. *Bande Mataram*, apart from its wonderful associations, expresses the one national wish—the rise of India to her full height. And I should prefer *Bande Mataram* to *Bharat Mataki Jai*, as it would be a graceful recognition of the intellectual and emotional superiority of Bengal. Since India can be nothing without the union of the Hindu and the Muslim heart, *Hindu-Mussalmanki Jai* is a cry which we may never forget.

There should be no discordance in these cries. Immediately some one has taken up any of the three cries, the rest should take it up and not attempt to yell out their favourite. Those who do not wish to join may refrain, but they should consider it a breach of etiquette to interpolate their own when a cry has already been raised. It would be better too always to follow out the three cries in the order given above. Nor should cries be

incessantly shouted. One often hears an incessant yell when a popular leader is passing through a station. I doubt if this incessant noise does the slightest good to the nation except to provide an indifferent exercise for one's lungs. Moreover, it is necessary to think of our hero's nerves and time. It is a national waste to keep him occupied in gazing at a crowd and hearing a cry in his praise or any other for full thirty minutes. We must cultivate the sense of proportion.

viii. Untouchability

THE SIN OF UNTOUCHABILITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 19, 1921.)

It is worthy of note that the Subjects Committee accepted without any opposition the clause regarding the sin of untouchability. It is well that the National Assembly passed the resolution stating that the removal of this blot on Hinduism was necessary for the attainment of Swaraj. The Devil succeeds only by receiving help from his fellows. He always takes advantage of the weakest spots in our natures in order to gain mastery over us. Even so does the Government retain its control over us through our weaknesses or vices. And if we would render ourselves proof against its machinations, we must remove our weaknesses. It is for that reason that I have called non-co-operation a process of purification. As

soon as that process is completed, this government must fall to pieces for want of the necessary environment, just as mosquitos cease to haunt a place whose cess-pools are filled up and dried.

Has not a just Nemesis overtaken us for the crime of untouchability? Have we not reaped as we have sown? Have we not practised Dyerism and O'Dwyerism on our own kith and kin? We have segregated the 'pariah' and we are in turn segregated in the British Colonies. We deny him the use of public wells; we throw the leavings of our plates at him. His very shadow pollutes us. Indeed there is no charge that the 'pariah' cannot fling in our faces and which we do not fling in the faces of Englishmen.

How is this blot on Hinduism to be removed? 'Do unto others as your would that others should do unto you.' I have often told English officials that, if they are friends and servants of India, they should come down from their pedestal, cease to be patrons, demonstrate by their loving deeds that they are in every respect our friends, and believe us to be equals in the same sense they believe fellow Englishmen to be their equals. After the experiences of the Punjab and the Khilafat, I have gone a step further and asked them to repent and to change their hearts. Even so is it necessary for us Hindus to repent of the wrong we have done, to alter our behaviour towards those whom we have 'suppressed' by a system as devilish* as we believe the English system of the

* Writing in *Young India* of September 29, 1921, Mr. Gandhi said —

The Panchamas—Nowhere is the "untouchable" so cruelly treated as in this Madras presidency. His very shadow defiles the Brahman. He

Government of India to be. We must not throw a few miserable schools at them, we must not adopt the air of superiority towards them. We must treat them as our blood brothers as they are in fact. We must return to them the inheritance of which we have robbed them. And this must not be the act of a few English-knowing reformers merely, but it must be a conscious voluntary effort on the part of the masses. We may not wait till eternity for this much belated reformation. We must aim at bringing it about within this year of grace, probation, prepartion, and *tapasya*. It is a reform not to follow *Swaraj* but to precede it.

may not even pass through Brahman streets. Non-Brahmans treat him no better. And between the two, the Panchama as he is called in these parts is ground to atoms. And yet Madras is a land of mighty temples and religious devotion. The people with their big *tilak* marks, their long locks and their bare clean bodies look like Rishis. But their religion seem almost to be exhausted in these outward observances. It is difficult to understand this Dyerism towards the most industrious and useful citizens in a land that has produced Shankara and Ramanuja. And in spite of the satanic treatment of our own kith and kin in this part of India, I retain my faith in these Southern people. I have told them at all their huge meetings in no uncertain terms, that there can be no *Swaraj* without the removal of the curse from our midst. I have told them that our being treated as social lepers in practically the whole world is due to our having treated a fifth of our own race as such. Non-co-operation is a plea for a change of heart, not merely in the English but equally in ourselves. Indeed I expect the change first in us and then as a matter of course in the English. A nation that can throw away an age-long curse in a year, a nation that can shed the drink habit as we shed our garments, a nation that can return to its original industry and suddenly utilise its spare hours to manufacture sixty crores worth of cloth during a single year is a transformed nation. Its transformation must react upon the world. It must constitute even for the scoffer a convincing demonstration of God's existence and grace, and so I say, that if India can become transformed in this wise, no power on earth can deny India's right to establish *Swaraj*. ✓ In

Untouchability is not a sanction of religion, it is a device of Satan. The devil has always quoted scriptures. But scriptures cannot transcend reason and truth. They are intended to purify reason and illuminate truth. I am not going to burn a spotless horse because the Vedas are reported to have advised, tolerated, or sanctioned the sacrifice. For me the Vedas are divine and unwritten. 'The letter killeth'. It is the spirit that giveth the light. And the spirit of the Vedas is purity, truth, innocence, chastity, humility, simplicity, forgiveness, godliness, and all that makes a man or woman noble and brave. There is neither nobility nor bravery in treating the great and uncomplaining scavengers of the nation as worse than dogs to be despised and spat upon. Would that God gave us the strength and the wisdom to become voluntary scavengers of the nation as the suppressed classes are

spite of all the clouds that are thickening on the Indian horizon, I make bold to prophesy that the moment India has repented of her treatment of the 'untouchables' and has boycotted foreign cloth, that moment India will be hailed, by the very English officials who seem to have hardened their hearts, as a free and a brave nation. And because, I believe that if Hindus will, it is possible for them to enfranchise the so-called Panchamas and extend to them the same rights that they claim for themselves, and it is possible for India, if she wills, to manufacture all the cloth she needs even as she cooks all the food she eats I therefore also believe that Swaraj is attainable this year. The transformation cannot take place by any elaborately planned mechanical action. But it can take place if God's grace is with us. Who can deny that God is working a wonderful change in the hearts of every one of us? Any way it is the duty of every Congress worker everywhere to befriend the untouchable brother, and to plead with the un-Hindu Hindus, that Hinduism of the Vedas, the Upanishads, Hinduism of the Bhagavad Gita and of Shankara and Ramanuja contains no warrant for treating a single human being, no matter how fallen, as an untouchable. Let every Congressman plead in the gentlest manner possible with orthodoxy, that the bar sinister is the very negation of Ahimsa.

forced to be. There are Augean stables enough and to spare for us to clean.

‘DEPRESSED’ CLASSES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*October 27, 1920.*)

Vivekananda used to call the Panchamas ‘suppressed classes.’ There is no doubt that Vivekananda’s is a more accurate adjective. We have suppressed them and have consequently become ourselves depressed. That we have become the ‘Pariahs of the Empire’ is, in Gokhale’s language, the retributive justice meted out to us by a just God. A correspondent indignantly asks me in a pathetic letter reproduced elsewhere, * what I am doing for them.

* The following is the letter referred to —

Satyagraha and the Depressed Classes :—Now that the most advanced and vociferous section of the politically-minded classes have adopted non-co-operation (nominally, at any rate) under your leadership, the masses of the population known in this part of India as the backward and the depressed classes are filled with hope and are resolved by some such method to get the age-long, nay, immemorial social disabilities under which they still suffer, and compared with which the Punjab tragedy itself was but a passing evil, removed as soon as possible. I am writing this letter to you in order to sound your opinion on this matter and, if possible, to be favoured with your advice. One would have thought that you yourself would, one of these days, start such a campaign for the removal of certain indigenous social injustices which are some centuries older than any British injustice, and it goes without saying that you are the person best fitted to lead such a movement. But for some wonderful reason known only to yourself you have started it at the wrong end for the righting of certain political wrongs of yesterday. But that is a matter which concerns only your own conscience. What will your advice to us be? There is a growing volume of opinion among the Panchamas and Thiyyas, for

I have given the letter with the correspondent's own heading. Should not we, the Hindus, wash our blood-stained hands before we ask the English to wash theirs? This is a proper question seasonably put. And if a member of a slave nation could deliver the suppressed classes from their slavery without freeing myself from my own, I would do so to-day. But it is an impossible task. A slave has not the freedom even to do the right thing. It is right for me to prohibit the importation of foreign goods, but I have no power to bring it about. It was right for Maulana Mahomed Ali to go to Turkey and to tell the Turks personally that India was with them in their righteous struggle. He was not free to do so. If I had a truly national legislature, I would answer Hindu insolence by erecting special and better wells for the exclusive use of suppressed classes and by erecting better and more numerous schools for them, so that there would be not a single member of the suppressed classes left without a school to teach their children. But I must wait for that better day.

Meanwhile, are the depressed classes to be left to

instance, to resort to direct action (with strict regard to *Satya* and *Ahimsa*) against such diabolical practices as distance pollution, the denial of the right of entry into certain public roads, the refusal of equal educational opportunities such as free access to all state-aided schools and the forcible shutting up of public wells, public tanks and (sometimes) public taps so far as these poor people who count a few millions are concerned.

I have talked this matter over with some of the leading men of the community and they are anxious to know your views on this subject. That is why I am writing this letter. Is it not incumbent on us to ensure such rudimentary rights of humanity to all our fellow countrymen by *Satyagraha* before we set out to win the elementary rights of British citizenship for ourselves by the same method?

their own resources? Nothing of the sort. In my own humble manner I have done and am doing all I can for Panchama brothers.

There are three courses open to these down-trodden members of the nation. For their impatience they may call in the assistance of the slave owning Government. They will get it, but they will fall from the frying pan into the fire. To-day they are slaves of slaves. By seeking Government aid, they will be used for suppressing their kith and kin. Instead of being sinned against they will themselves be the sinners. The Mussalmans tried it and failed. They found that they were worse off than before. The Sikhs did it unwittingly and failed. To-day there is no more discontented community in India than the Sikhs. Government aid is, therefore, no solution. The second is rejection of Hinduism and wholesale conversion to Islam or Christianity. And if a change of religion could be justified for worldly betterment, I would advise it without hesitation. But religion is a matter of the heart. No physical inconvenience can warrant abandonment of one's own religion. If the inhuman treatment of the Panchamas were a part of Hinduism, its rejection would be a paramount duty both for them and for those like me who would not make a fetish even of religion and condone every evil in its sacred name. But I believe that untouchability is no part of Hinduism. It is rather its excrescence to be removed by every effort. And there is quite an army of Hindu reformers who have set their heart upon ridding Hinduism of this blot. Conversion, therefore, I hold, is no remedy whatsoever.

Then there remains, finally, self-help and self-dependence, with such aid as the non-Panchama Hindus will render of their own motion, not as a matter of patronage but as a matter of duty. And herein comes the use of non-co-operation. I would favour well-regulated non-co-operation for this acknowledged evil. But non-co-operation means independence of outside help ; it means effort from within. It would not be non-co-operation to insist on visiting prohibited areas. That may be civil disobedience if it is peacefully carried out. But I have found to my cost that civil disobedience requires far greater preliminary training and self-control. All can non-co-operate, but few only can offer civil disobedience. Therefore, by way of protest against Hinduism, the Panchamas can certainly stop all contact and connection with the other Hindus so long as the special grievances are maintained. But this means organised intelligent effort. And so far as I can see, there is no leader among the Panchamas who can lead them to victory through non-co-operation.

The better way therefore, perhaps, is for the Panchamas heartily to join the great national movement that is now going on for throwing off the slavery of the present Government. It is easy enough for the Panchama friends to see that non-co-operation against this evil Government pre-supposes co-operation between the different sections forming the Indian nation. * The Hindus

* In reply to a correspondent, Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of December 29, 1920 :—Non-co-operation against the Government means co-operation among the governed, and if Hindus do not remove the sin of untouchability, there will be no Swaraj whether in one year or in one

must realise that, if they wish to offer successful non-co-operation against the Government, they must make common cause with the Panchamas, even as they have made common cause with the Mussalmans. Non-co-operation when it is free from violence is essentially a movement of intensive self-purification. That process has commenced and whether the Panchamas deliberately take part in it or not, the rest of the Hindus dare not neglect them without hampering their own progress. Hence though the Panchama problem is as dear to me as life itself, I rest satisfied with the exclusive attention to national non-co-operation. I feel sure that the greater includes the less *

hundred years If I invite the depressed classes to join the movement of non-co-operation, I do so because I want them to realise their strength. Swaraj is as unattainable without the removal of the sin of untouchability as it is without Hindu-Muslim unity.

* Continuing the controversy in *Young India* of November 17, 1920, the correspondent, Mr S. M. Michael, wrote :—

In commenting on my letter in your leading article of the 27th October, you have virtually admitted my principal contention that "we Hindus should wash our own blood stained hands before we ask the English to wash theirs," to borrow your own powerful phraseology. But are you not practically asking the English to do so? You admit that mine is "a proper question seasonably put." Does it not strike you, then, that the present political movement which you have started is, to say the least, a bit premature? I distinctly remember to have read in one of your speeches in the early days of your work here, that if only we Indians remove our internal evils and social handicaps, Self-government will come to us without our seeking or asking for it. I am profoundly sorry that you have changed your opinion since then. I regard it as nothing short of a national calamity. But I pray you not to misunderstand those of us who still hold the same view. It is because they still sincerely hold this view that the suppressed millions and the non-Brahmins of Madras and the Deccan, who represent the masses of the people in these parts, have so resolutely set their faces against your political non-co-operation move-

MR. GANDHI & THE SUPPRESSED CLASSES

A CHAPTER OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY

(April 27, 1921.)

Mr. Gandhi presided at the Suppressed Classes Conference held at Ahmedabad on the 14th and 15th instant. There was a large attendance of ladies and gentlemen from the town, though the number of the untouchables was much less than expected, a rumour having spread in the town that Government would arrest those of them who attended.

Mr. Gandhi regretted in the beginning this small attendance, and said that, incidents as the present, took away what little faith he had in conferences as an effective agency of social reform. If therefore he occupied the

ment which, in their judgment, is like putting the cart before the horse. They fervently believe that on the whole the British Raj is the best for time being, and that even if you succeed in establishing Indian independence to-morrow, it will be lost in no time to the Afghans or the Japanese, if it is not wrecked and broken to pieces on the rock of caste as it has been more than once in our long and chequered history. They, therefore, intend to make democracy safe for India before India achieves democracy—safe from internal enemies as well as external foes. That is why they, while thanking you for inviting them to join your movement, will thank you still more if you give it up and join them in their noble endeavours of making India a fit and lasting home for democracy. Phrases as "slaves of slaves," and "the greater includes the less" are, no doubt, admirable dialectics which might conceivably deceive the shallow, superficial reader, but they sound hollow in the ears of all practical minded folk. Is it too much to hope you will see your "error of judgment" yet and turn your attention, to the task of social amelioration which, to quote from your old speeches, is the surest and the best way of winning Swaraj for India.

Replying to the above, Mr. Gandhi wrote—"I gladly publish this reply. Evidently Mr. Michael is not a regular or careful student of *Young India*.

audience shorter than they expected, it would be because his remarks would not reach all he meant to address and not because his enthusiasm for the work was in any way damped. He was also thankful for the fact that the conference had brought him the pleasure of meeting friends on the same platform—it was not usual for him nowadays to meet—friends, co-operation with whom used to be a pleasure and privilege, but from whom the present conditions had unfortunately cut him off. It was happy, however, that on the question of untouchability he was in the same boat as they.

Coming to the subject he said:—I do not know how I am to convince those who oppose the reform, of the wrong position they have taken. How am I to plead with those who regard any contact with the members of the suppressed community as entailing defilement and of

If he were he should have known that non-co-operation is a process of purification. He will find when Swaraj is established by the method of non-co-operation, that there will be no Pariah or non-Brahmin problem left to be solved. I adhere to my statement that amelioration of radical social evils meant an attainment of Swaraj, but I did not then realise that the British Government was the greatest of all the social evils with which society was cursed. This Government must therefore perish if it does not repent, as surely as Hinduism must perish if it does not purge itself of the blot on itself in the shape of untouchability. My difference with Mr. Michael is of the same type as with the Hindus who do not see the satanic character of untouchability. Mr. Michael does not see in the present system of Government the growing degradation of the nation to which he belongs. It may therefore be right for him to tolerate the British Government. It is sinful for me to do so in its present state. And I am now engaged in employing the same remedy against the present system of Government, as I have applied against the system of untouchability in Hinduism. Mr. Michael has strayed from his subject in talking of the Afghan invasion. He would forgive me if, instead of answering this new objection, I refer him to the pages of this journal.

which they cannot be cleansed without necessary ablutions, and who thus regard omission to perform the ablutions a sin? I can only place before them my innermost convictions.

I regard untouchability as the greatest blot of Hinduism. This idea was not brought home to me by my bitter experiences during the S African struggle. It is not due to the fact that I was once an agnostic. It is equally wrong to think, as some people do, that I have taken my views from my study of Christian religious literature. These views date as far back as the time when I was neither enamoured of, nor was acquainted with, the Bible or the followers of the Bible.

I was hardly yet twelve when this idea had dawned on me. A scavenger named Uka, an untouchable, used to attend our house for cleaning latrines. Often I would ask my mother why it was wrong to touch him, why I was forbidden to touch him. If I accidentally touched Uka, I was asked to perform the ablutions, and though I naturally obeyed, it was not without smilingly protesting that untouchability was not sanctioned by religion, that it was impossible that it should be so. I was a very dutiful and obedient child and so far as it was consistent with respect for parents. I often had tussels with them on this matter. I told my mother that she was entirely wrong in considering physical contact with Uka as sinful.

While at school I would often happen to touch the "untouchables", and as I never would conceal the fact from my parents, my mother would tell me that the shortest cut to purification after the unholy touch was to cancel the touch by touching any Mussalman passing by.

And simply out of reverence and regard for my mother I often did so, but never did so believing it to be a religious obligation. After some time we shifted to Porebandar, where I made my first acquaintance with Sanskrit. I was not yet put to an English school, and my brother and I were placed in charge of a Brahmin, who taught us *Ram Raksha* and *Vishnu Punjar*. The texts "*jale Vishnuh*" "*sthale Vishnuh*" (there is the Lord (present) in water, there is the Lord (present) in earth), have never gone out of my memory. A motherly old dame used to live close by. Now it happened that I was very timid then, and would conjure up ghosts and goblins whenever the lights went out, and it was dark. The old mother, to disabuse me of fears, suggested that I should mutter the *Ramraksha* texts whenever I was afraid, and all evil spirits would fly away. This I did and, as I thought, with good effect. I could never believe then that there was any text in the *Ramraksha* pointing to the contact of the 'untouchables' as a sin. I did not understand its meaning then, or understood it very imperfectly. But I was confident that *Ramrakhsha*, which could destroy all fear of ghosts, could not be countenancing any such thing as fear of contact with the 'untouchables'.

The *Ramayana* used to be regularly read in our family. A Brahmin called Ladha Maharaj used to read it. He was stricken with leprosy, and he was confident that a regular reading of the *Ramayana* would cure him of leprosy, and indeed, he was cured of it. "How can the *Ramayana*," I thought to myself, "in which one who is regarded nowadays as an 'untouchable', took Rama across the Ganges in his boat, countenance the idea of any

human beings being 'untouchables' on the ground that they were polluted souls?" The fact that we addressed God as the 'purifier of the polluted' and by similar appellations, shows that it is a sin to regard any one born in Hinduism as polluted or untouchable—that it is satanic to do so. I have hence been never tired of repeating that it is a great sin. I do not pretend that this thing had crystallised as a conviction in me at the age of twelve, but I do say that I did then regard untouchability as a sin. I narrate this story for the information of the Vaishnavas and orthodox Hindus.

I have always claimed to be a *Sanatani* Hindu. It is not that I am quite innocent of the scriptures. I am not a profound scholar of Sanskrit. I have read the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads* only in translations. Naturally therefore mine is not a scholarly study of them. My knowledge of them is in no way profound, but I have studied them as I should do as a Hindu and I claim to have grasped their true spirit. By the time I had reached the age of 21, I had studied other religions also.

There was a time when I was wavering between Hinduism and Christianity. When I recovered my balance of mind, I felt that to me salvation was possible only through the Hindu religion and my faith in Hinduism grew deeper and more enlightened.

But even then I believed that untouchability was no part of Hinduism; and, that if it was, such Hinduism was not for me.

True Hinduism does not regard untouchability as a sin. I do not want to enter into any controversy regarding the interpretation of the shastras. It might be diffi-

cult for me to establish my point by quoting authorities from the *Bhagwat* or *Manu Smriti*. But I claim to have understood the spirit of Hinduism. Hinduism has sinned in giving sanction to untouchability. It has degraded us, made us the pariahs of the Empire. Even the Mussalmans caught the sinful contagion from us, and in S. Africa, in E. Africa and in Canada the Mussalmans no less than Hindus came to be regarded as pariahs. All this evil has resulted from the sin of untouchability.

I may here recall my proposition, which is this: So long as the Hindus wilfully regard untouchability as part of their religion, so long as the mass of Hindus consider it a sin to touch a section of their brethren, Swaraj is impossible of attainment. Yudhishtira would not enter heaven without his dog. How can, then, the descendants of that Yudhishtira expect to obtain Swaraj without the untouchables? What crimes, for which we condemn the Government as satanic, have not we been guilty of towards our untouchable brethren?

We are guilty of having suppressed our brethren; we make them crawl on their bellies; we have made them rub their noses on the ground; with eyes red with rage, we push them out of railway compartments—what more than this has British rule done?) What charge, that we bring against Dyer and O'Dwyer, may not others, and even our own people, lay at our doors? We ought to purge ourselves of this pollution. It is idle to talk of Swaraj so long as we do not protect the weak and the helpless, or so long as it is possible for a single Swarajist to injure the feelings of any individual. Swaraj means that not a single Hindu or Muslim shall for a moment arro-

gantly think that he can crush with impunity meek Hindus or Muslims. Unless this condition is fulfilled we will gain Swaraj only to lose it the next moment. We are no better than the brutes until we have purged ourselves of the sins we have committed against our weaker brethren.

But I have faith in me still. In the course of my peregrinations in India I have realised that the spirit of kindness of which the Poet Tulsidas sings so eloquently, which forms the corner-stone of the Jain and Vaishnava religions, which is the quintessence of the *Bhagavat* and which every verse of the Gita is saturated with—this kindness, this love, this charity, is slowly but steadily gaining ground in the hearts of the masses of this country.

Many a fracas between Hindus and Mussalmans is still heard of. There are still many of these who do not scruple to wrong one another. But as to the net result, I feel that kindness and charity have increased. The Hindus and Mahommedans have become God-fearing. We have shaken ourselves free from the hypnotism of law courts and Government schools, and no longer labour under many an other hallucination. I have also realized that those whom we regard as illiterate and ignorant are the very people who deserve to be called educated. They are more cultured than we, their lives are more righteous than ours. A little study of the present day mentality of the people will show that according, to the popular conception, Swaraj is synonymous with *Ram Raj*—the establishment of the Kingdom of Righteousness on earth.

If it can bring any comfort to you, my untouchable brethren, I would say that your question does not cause

so much stir as it used to do formerly. That does not mean that I expect you to cease to have misgivings about the Hindus. How can they deserve to be not mistrusted having wronged you so much? Swami Vivekanand used to say that the untouchables were not depressed, they were suppressed by the Hindus who in turn had suppressed themselves by suppressing them.

I suppose I was at Nellore on the 6th of April. I met the untouchables there and I prayed that day as I have done to-day. I do want to attain *Moksha*. I do not want to be reborn. But if I have to be reborn, I should be born an untouchable, so that I may share their sorrows, sufferings, and the affronts levelled at them, in order that I may endeavour to free myself and them from that miserable condition. I, therefore, prayed that if I should be born again, I should do so not as a Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, or Shudra, but as an Atishudra.

To-day is much more solemn than the sixth. It is hallowed by the memory of the massacre of thousands of innocents. And I prayed, therefore, also to-day that if I should die with any of my desires unfructified, with my service of the untouchables unfinished, with my Hinduism unfulfilled, I may be born again amongst the untouchables to bring my Hinduism to its fulfilment.

✓ I love scavengering. In my Ashram, an eighteen year old Brahmin lad is doing the scavenger's work in order to teach the Ashram scavenger cleanliness. The lad is no reformer. He was born and bred in orthodoxy. He is a regular reader of the *Gita* and faithfully performs *Sandhyarandana*. His pronunciation of Sanskrit verses is more faultless than mine. When he conducts the prayer, his

soft sweet melodies melt one into love. But he felt that his accomplishments were incomplete until he had become also a perfect sweeper, and that, if he wanted the Ashram sweeper to do his work well, he must do it himself and set an example.

You should realize that you are cleaning Hindu society. You have therefore to purify your lives. You should cultivate the habits of cleanliness, so that no one may point his finger at you. Use alkali ash or earth, if you cannot afford to use soap, to keep yourselves clean. Some of you are given to drinking and gambling which you must get rid of. You will point your finger at the Brahmins and say even they are given to these vices. But they are not looked upon as polluted, and you are. You must not ask the Hindus to emancipate you as a matter of favour. Hindus must do so, if they want, in their own interests. You should, therefore, make them feel ashamed by your own purity and cleanliness. I believe that we shall have purified ourselves within the next five months. If my expectations are not fulfilled, I will think that, although my proposition was fundamentally correct, yet I was wrong in my calculation; and I will again say that I had erred in my calculation.

You claim to be Hindus; you read the Bhagavat; if, therefore, the Hindus oppress you, then you should understand that the fault does not lie in the Hindu religion but in those who profess it. In order to emancipate yourselves you shall have to purify yourselves. You shall have to get rid of evil habits like drinking.

If you want to ameliorate your condition, if you want to obtain Swaraj, you should be self-reliant. I was told in

Bombay that some of you are opposed to N. C. O. and believe that salvation is only possible through the British Government. Let me tell you that you will never be able to obtain redress by discarding Hindu religion and court- ing the favour of a third party. Your emancipation lies in your own hands.

I have come in contact with the untouchables all over the country ; and I have observed that immense possibilities lie latent in them of which neither they nor the rest of the Hindus seem to be aware. Their intellect is of virginal purity. I ask you to learn spinning and weaving, and if you take them up as a profession, you will keep poverty from your doors. As regards your attitude towards the *bhangis*, I will repeat what I said at Godhra. I cannot understand why you should yourselves countenance the distinction between *Dheds* and *Bhangis*. There is no difference between them. Even in normal times their occupation is as honourable as that of lawyers or Government servants.

“ You should now cease to accept leavings from plates however clean they may be represented to be. Receive grain only—good, sound grain, not rotten grain, and that too only if it is courteously offered. If you are able to do all I have asked you to do, you will secure your emancipation, not in four or five months, but in so many days.

“ Two of the strongest desires that keep me in flesh and bone are the emancipation of the untouchables and the protection of the cow. When these two desires are fulfilled, there is Swaraj, and therein lies my own *Moksha*. May God give you strength to work out your salvation.”

MORE DIFFICULTIES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 24, 1920.)

The resolution of the Senate of the Gujarat National University * in regard to Mr. Andrews' question about the admission of children of the 'depressed' classes to the schools affiliated to that University is reported to have raised a flutter in Ahmedabad. Not only has the flutter given satisfaction to a *Times of India* correspondent, but the occasion has led to the discovery by him of another defect in the constitution of the Senate in that it does not contain a single Muslim member. The discovery, however, I may inform the reader, is no proof of the want of national character of the University. The Hindu-Muslim unity is no mere lip expression. It requires no artificial proofs. The simple reason why there is no Mussalman representative on the Senate is that no higher educated Mussalman, able to give his time, has been found to take sufficient interest in the national education movement. I merely refer to this matter to show that we must reckon with attempts to discredit the movement even by misinterpretation of motives. That is a difficulty from without and easier to deal with.

The 'depressed' classes difficulty is internal and therefore far more serious, because it may give rise to a split

* Mr. Andrews wrote to *Young India* of Nov. 3, 1920, asking whether all the national schools and colleges were open to the depressed classes. His letter was referred to the Senate of the Gujarat National University which passed a resolution to the effect that, in accordance with the constitution of the Senate, no institution that specially excluded the depressed classes could be affiliated.

and weaken the cause—no cause can survive internal difficulties if they are indefinitely multiplied. Yet there can be no surrender in the matter of principles for the avoidance of splits. You cannot promote a cause when you are undermining it by surrendering its vital parts. The ‘depressed’ classes problem is a vital part of the cause. *Swaraj* is as inconceivable without full reparation to the ‘depressed’ classes as it is impossible without real Hindu-Muslim unity. In my opinion we have become ‘pariahs of the Empire’ because we have created ‘pariahs’ in our midst. The slave owner is always more hurt than the slave. We shall be unfit to gain *Swaraj* so long as we would keep in bondage a fifth of the population of Hindustan. Have we not made the ‘pariah’ crawl on his belly? Have we not segregated him? And if it is religion so to treat the ‘pariah’, it is the religion of the white race to segregate us. And if it is no argument for the white races to say that we are satisfied with the badge of our inferiority, it is less for us to say that the ‘pariah’ is satisfied with his. Our slavery is complete when we begin to hug it.

The Gujarat Senate therefore counted the cost when it refused to bend before the storm. This non-co-operation is a process of self-purification. We may not cling to putrid customs and claim the pure boon of *Swaraj*. Untouchability, I hold, is a custom, not an integral part of Hinduism. The world has advanced in thought, though it is still barbarous in action. And no religion can stand which is not based on fundamental truths. Any glorification of error will destroy a religion as surely as disregard of a disease is bound to destroy a body.

This government of ours is an unscrupulous corporation. It has ruled by dividing 'Mussalmans from Hindus. It is quite capable of taking advantage of the internal weaknesses of Hinduism. It will set the 'depressed' classes against the rest of the Hindus, non-Brahmins against Brahmins. The Gujarat Senate resolution does not end the trouble. It merely points out the difficulty. The trouble will end only when the masses and classes of Hindus have rid themselves of the sin of untouchability. A Hindu lover of *Swaraj* will as assiduously work for the amelioration of the lot of the 'depressed' classes as he works for Hindu-Muslim unity. * We must treat them as our brothers and give them the same rights that we claim for ourselves.

* "Disappearing Untouchability"—Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of April 27, 1921 —Of all the sweet experiences during my Gujarat tour, none was sweeter than the sympathetic manner in which the "suppressed" were received by the other Hindus. Everywhere the audience has received my remarks on the matter without resentment. At Kalol there was to be a meeting of 'untouchables' to be addressed by me. I pleaded with the Mahajans that they should permit me to address them in the pandal erected for the general meeting. After some hesitation they agreed. I was to have gone to fetch these 'outcastes' from their quarters. Their abode was too far from the pandal to enable them to come. I, therefore, addressed them near the hospital. But I was glad to note that many orthodox Hindus, who accompanied me, freely mixed with the men and women who had flocked round me from the pariah quarters. But the height of satisfaction was reached when in Shisodra, a big village near Navsari, there were knowingly admitted to the place reserved for the elite of the village, all the many Dheds who were standing at a distance from the great meeting which I was addressing. As they were admitted, not a man or woman moved or protested. Almost every one in the village was present at the meeting. People from surrounding villages too had attended. This deliberate and solemn admission of several hundred men and women of the untouchable class to the centre of a great gathering like

ix. Peace Celebrations

PEACE CELEBRATIONS

(November 19, 1919.)

The question of the Peace Celebrations is one of the most hotly discussed of the day. Mr. Gandhi's letter * suggesting non-participation until the Khilafat question is solved to the satisfaction of our Moslem brethren may

the above is to me a sure sign of the pure religious character of the movement. Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel in order to make assurance doubly sure, asked those who approved of the step to raise their hands, and quite a forest of hands went up. The experiment was repeated in Bardoli before an equally large audience and with equally satisfactory results. Untouchability is surely disappearing, and with its disappearance the way to Swaraj is becoming safe and easy.

* **Can We Honestly Rejoice** —Mr. Gandhi addressed the following letter to the Press (*Young India*, November 5, 1919).

Several friends have enquired what should be the position regarding the forthcoming peace celebrations. On the Khilafat day, I know that resolutions were passed at some meetings to the effect that the Muhammadans could not participate in the celebrations, if the Khilafat question was not satisfactorily settled, as there can be no peace in Indian estimation. So long as the great question remains unsolved and the Mahomedan sentiment is in danger of being lacerated and millions of the Mahomedans remaining in suspense or grief, it is hardly possible for Hindus, Parsis, Christians, Jews and others for whom India is the land of their adoption or birth to take part in the forthcoming rejoicings. I venture to think that His Excellency the Viceroy can, if he will, tell his Majesty's Ministers that Indians can not participate in the celebrations so long as the Khilafat question remains unsettled and I do hope that His Majesty's Ministers will recognise the necessity of securing and publishing an honourable settlement of the question before asking us to take part in the peace celebrations.

In the course of his presidential address to the All-India Khilafat Conference at Delhi on November 24, 1919, Mr. Gandhi referred to the Peace Celebrations as follows :—

have stung to fury the Anglo-Indian section of the Press, but there is no doubt that much before Mr. Gandhi's letter to the Press, the question was on the *tapis* in Moslem circles and a large section of the community had decided against participation. If there was any doubt as to this, it has been cleared by the statements of Dr. Ansari and Moulana Hasrat Mohani who were interviewed by some Indian Press representatives.

The Anglo-Indian Press who, with the probable exception of the *Times of India*, refuse to recognise the gravity of the Khilafat question, is naturally fretting and fuming at the suggestion of non-participation. But even the *Pioneer*, while in a characteristically Pecksniffian spirit rating Mr. Gandhi for robbing the poor and the destitute of their peace day gifts of food and raiments, recognises the strength of Indian feeling, and shrewdly suggests the dropping of what to it is at best a piece of belated enthusiasm. The Indian Press is happily unanimous regarding the gravity of the Khilafat question and should,

The Khilafat Conference has come to the decision not to participate in the forthcoming peace celebrations. I think that it is a proper decision. Peace celebrations can have no meaning for India whilst a vital part of the peace, affecting one-fourth of India's population, remains undeclared. Eight crores of Mahomedans are deeply interested in the peace terms affecting the Khilafat. It is improper to ask them to celebrate peace whilst the fate of the Khilafat hangs in the balance. To ask India to celebrate peace whilst the Khilafat question remains unsettled is like expecting France to celebrate peace, pending the settlement of Alsace-Lorraine. That Turkey is outside India does not affect the comparison. England is as much a Mahomedan and Hindu power, as it is a Christian power, and if India be a partner in the Empire, then Mahomedan sentiment deserves as much placating as any other. It would, therefore, be the most seeming thing for His Excellency the Viceroy to postpone the peace celebrations pending a satisfactory settlement of the Khilafat question.—*Young India*, December 3, 1919.

one might expect, be unanimously against participation. There is however a strange exception and for once at least the Anglo-Indian papers have found an occasion on which to enthuse over the suggestions of a prominent Indian paper. The high place which the *Leader* occupies in the Indian Press compels us to examine its position at some length. We understand and appreciate the *Leader's* appeal for clear thinking in the country and advice to the people that they should not follow Mr. Gandhi blindly. Perhaps no one feels more strongly than Mr. Gandhi that he should not be followed blindly. Let then the people judge and decide for themselves. It is curious, however, that the same paper, while urging the need for clear thinking, should try to mystify people by raising irrelevant issues. "One has only to exert his imagination a little," it says, "to realize what the plight of the British empire and along with it of India which is a part of it, would have been if Germany had won, to come to the conclusion that there is every reason for thankfulness and congratulation that the crowning victory has been achieved." Why, one has not to exercise any imagination at all to see that the peace—and peace with victory—has been a blessing of the All-Merciful Providence to whom every one has to be thankful. Even Lord Morley who was opposed to the idea of war and who should be indifferent to its result, must be feeling thankful that the British nation is free from the agonies of a wicked war. There must be many in England whom all that has followed peace must not have satisfied, and still they must also be feeling thankful. However none of them will get drunk over

the settlement that the peace has brought with it. It is stupid to argue that because they refuse thus to get drunk, they desire that the war should have been terminated otherwise. The argument of the *Leader* and those who think with it, when cleared of its euphemism, amounts to that and nothing more. When of old, kings who were brothers-in-law to each other fought, the wife of the victor king naturally abstained from peace rejoicings as it was her brother who was conquered, and she could do it without being considered guilty of desiring that the result of the fighting should have been otherwise. The refusal to participate in the Peace Celebrations is nothing but a peaceful protest against the *terms* of a peace that has failed to bring peace to some organs of the body politic and therefore to the whole body politic, and not a protest against the state of peace itself.

"India wants to grow," argues the *Leader*, "India wants to prosper and live within the British Empire." We emphatically say, "Yes"; but she does not want to do so by submissively assenting to a national wrong or by pusillanimously smothering its feelings of natural resentment. It would ill become her, and it would ill become the Empire if she were to do so. She must show the world that the only self-respecting course for her is to refuse to participate in celebrations.

The third argument, if it may be called an argument, is that the people should not follow Mr. Gandhi, *not* because his advice is unsound, but because by so doing they would encourage him in what to it appears to be a most dangerous career. It thus expresses its fright: "Mr. Gandhi has extended his passive resist-

ance movement in a very *subtle* manner from domestic politics to international affairs and now the people are called upon to extend it to an imperial function also. They must cry a halt there." We are sorry to see that the truth has dawned on the *Leader* so late. Mr. Gandhi, of course, has never disguised his goal. He is convinced that without Satyagraha in all affairs—domestic, national, international or imperial—there will be no real peace, that at any rate India will not be free and peaceful unless she adopts and practises Satyagraha. He has never pretended to be a politician or a statesman. He is fired—we would not hesitate to say possessed—with an idea, it can give him no rest, others no rest, unless it is realised, and the faith that it will be realized keeps him up. But the scare of Satyagraha has driven the paper into statements which it otherwise would not make. It exclaims: "A widespread spirit of protest has been raised which he (Mr. Gandhi) is utilizing in various ways." We ask our contemporary to pause and consider if the statement is just and fair. It can only proceed from one who has chosen to misunderstand Mr. Gandhi. But we shall not quarrel with the journal's views about Mr. Gandhi. We may only remind it, if that can lift the scare, that the suggestion of non-participation is not one of passive resistance or Satyagraha, even as the *Sixth of April* observance was not passive resistance or Satyagraha. Non-participation is only the expression of the public consciousness that the country has been wronged. Participation in the Celebrations with the consciousness of the national wrong is nothing short of positive dissimulation, a thing which least befits a self-respecting country.

PEACE CELEBRATIONS

(December 1, 1919.)

Thus Mr. Natarajan, Editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, Bombay, in a note on the Khilafat question and the Peace Celebrations: "Many persons who have a sincere respect for Mr. Gandhi will, we think, be at a loss to follow his line of argument leading to the conclusion that because the question of the Khilafat has not been satisfactorily settled, therefore, it is the duty of Indians, Hindus and Mahomedans, to abstain from taking part in the Peace Celebrations next month. If this principle were to be carried to its logical length, public life would become impossible. "Mr. Natarajan must indeed have a curious definition of 'public life,' if he makes this statement with any seriousness. In fact unless he means by 'public life' unquestioning co-operation with Government in any and every matter, his statement is opposed to all experience. Public life, as is commonly understood, should have long been extinct in the West, for, the principle objected to by Mr. Natarajan is there 'carried to its logical length.' The fact is a spirit of healthy protest underlying the principle is the salt of public life and the only circumstance which could make public life impossible is the extinction of that spirit. It would appear that Mr. Natarajan himself recognised the truth of this on a former occasion when he deplored and protested against the strangling of the *Bombay Chronicle* because, besides other reasons, "it filled an important place in the public life of the city and country." We believe he could not have been unmindful,

when he wrote this, of the fact that the most enduring contribution of the journal to public life was the energetic promotion of movements which were informed by a healthy spirit of protest. We can think of no more solid contribution to the public life of the country, at the present moment, than a reasoning abstention from the Peace Celebrations.

Mr. Natarajan's facile pen has drawn him into making some curious statements. We are to rejoice, he says, because the 'War is at an end and the reign of Peace has resumed its sway'. If we are to rejoice simply for that reason, Germany should also hold a hearty national peace festival. But we know Mr. Natarajan does not mean that. For he himself elsewhere asks us to rejoice because of "the victory which has been vouchsafed to the British Empire," and we form an integral part thereof. But there lies the rub. We form an integral part of the Empire and yet the victory is for the Empire *minus* us. The opponents of the Celebrations are, in effect, charged by Mr. Natarajan with preferring continuance of War to the conclusion of Peace. They do not prefer the continuance of War. Neither do they prefer a Peace pregnant with the possibilities of a more horrid War.

Mr. Natarajan is on slippery ground when he talks of some of the Muslim leaders not expecting the British Empire to achieve the impossible and their recognising that the British Government has earnestly tried to be faithful to the Muslims. The Rt. Hon. Amir Ali's latest letter to the *Times* published in the daily press and the latest public statements of Mr. Jinnah and Syed Hasan Imam give a flat lie to this. But we see that in a later

note Mr. Natarajan dogmatically 'deprecates' the views of the two last, though he quoted them, at first, in support of his position.

In his recent note Mr. Natarajan advances a fresh consideration: "Mr. Lloyd George has a Christian public in England to reconcile as well as a Moslem public in India to consider". We admit he has. But he is surely not bound to help a Christian public to repress "the efforts of a sorely afflicted nation to maintain their independence, their national existence and their hearth and home." He may surely not encourage a Christian public in their unrighteousness, and ask a Moslem public to give up a righteous cause.

Mr. Natarajan argues that if we cheerfully co-operate with the rest of the Empire in celebrating the Peace, the chance of a satisfactory settlement will be enhanced. This is just like asking us to vote a public address and a memorial to a Governor or a Viceroy who does not deserve one, to escape the chance of a worse Governor or Viceroy being sent in his stead. Who shall blame a man for not being joyful when he cannot and does not feel so? Or will Mr. Natarajan have us resort to camouflage?

While the *Indian Social Reformer* would have Mr. Gandhi consider neither the Khilafat question nor the Punjab grievances as a legitimate ground for abstention, the *Amrit Bazar Patrika* blames him for considering the former only as a legitimate ground and not the latter too. This is because both the papers have missed the crucial test, *viz.*, whether the Punjab grievance or the Khilafat question *does or does not arise* out of the Peace terms. The Khilafat question *does* and the Punjab grievance *does*

not * There is no doubt, as the *Amrit Bazar Patrika* says, the Punjab has been the scene of barbarous cruelties, but you cannot lay them at the door of the Peace Settlement. They are none of the doings of the Peace Conference, whereas the destruction of the Turkish Empire would mean, as Sir Abbas Ali Baig has said, the sowing by the Peace Conference the "seeds of unceasing bloodshed in the struggle for the emancipation of Islam." In the Khilafat question therefore we have a grievance against all the Allies, and we cannot co-operate with them if they choose to rejoice without placating us. On the other hand if the Khilafat question was equitably settled, we would all have reasons to rejoice though our rejoicings may take a subdued character, simply because it is not given to ordinary human nature to forget a private grief in a public rejoicing.

* On this point Mr. Gandhi, in his lecture at the Delhi Khilafat Conference, spoke as follows :—

However grievous the wrong done in the Punjab, I think we cannot abstain from the Imperial Celebrations on that score. We cannot say that the Punjab wrong is unredressed to justify our abstention. For we still expect redress. The Hunter Committee is still at work. Our own Committee is equally busy. Only if we are dissatisfied or suspicious about a matter directly arising out of the peace terms, can we decide upon abstention.

Such a one is only the Khilafat question. It arises out of the Khilafat question and not only are we in the dark about it but we fully apprehend that it may not be settled to our satisfaction. We shall be accused of having been thoughtless and without sense of proportion if we bring in the Punjab to justify abstention, and it will damage both the Khilafat and the Punjab question. The Khilafat question is a very serious one, and needs immediate remedies. We must isolate it if we wish to give to it its proper place and value. (*Young India*, December 10, 1919).

ANTI-CELEBRATIONS CAMPAIGN

(December 10, 1919.)

In an article on the Peace Celebrations the *New India* makes some remarks which in so far as they can be read as a consistent whole, may be considered here. The paper says in one place that it has "every sympathy with those who declare that they do not propose to participate in the Peace celebrations," in another that "non-participation in celebrations is both reasonable and capable of sound defence," and yet it repeatedly asserts that the British representatives at the Peace Conference have stood firmly by our demands, which amounts to a suggestion that the idea of abstention should be dropped. But we prefer to attach more weight to what is expressly stated than to what is implied, and take it that the paper is opposed only to the Anti-Peace Celebrations Campaign. It bases its opposition on several grounds, *viz* :.

(1) That Celebration of Peace is no menace whatever to the Indian interests, and it does not prejudge the Turkish question ;

(2) That Anti-Celebrations Campaign is calculated to endanger mutual goodwill as between Great Britain and India, and hamper the Government in this country in every possible way, and "are we justified in proceeding to that length because Great Britain either cannot help being in an acquiescent minority in the Councils of the Allies or must be prepared to go to war against them out of respect to Mussalman opinion in this country ?"

(3) That the Anti-Peace Celebration movement is a menace to peace, goodwill, and might, if accompanied

by general *hartals*, land the country into undesirable consequences.

We emphatically contradict the first statement. We refer the *New India* to the letter addressed by the Right Hon. Sir Syed Amir Ali to the *Times*, wherein he has stated as the main ground of his letter the persistent allegations of irresponsible men that Muslim India is quite indifferent in the matter of the Turkish settlement. It is easy to see that if the Peace Celebrations are allowed to pass off without protest, they may be easily represented in England as the willing participation of the Mahomedans and Hindus of India, in the Peace festival. But why go so far as England? Even in our own country there has been evidence of such a pernicious propaganda. The Hon. Mr. Fazlul Haq in his Presidential Address at the Khilafat Conference the other day said that the "lesser officials in the country are behaving themselves in a manner, which reveals an attitude of open hostility to Muslim feelings over the Turkish question. We have received authentic news from Sind of a systematic and organised conspiracy, fostered under official help and sympathy, to misrepresent Muslim feelings with regard to the questions concerning Khilafat." We ask our contemporary to suggest how to deal with this hostile propaganda but by an active Anti-Peace Celebrations propaganda. But probably the paper will retort by saying that even that hostile propaganda of misrepresentation of the Muslim feelings, in India and elsewhere, does not concern inasmuch as, like the Peace Celebrations, it constitutes no menace to our interests. It does not pre-judge the Turkish question. To this retort the reply

will be sufficient that nobody will bother himself about such a propaganda unless with some object, and a propaganda of misrepresentation of the feelings of a community can have an object only prejudicial to its interests.

The paper of course says that, if the celebration of Peace is a menace, *widespread* abstention will suffice to kill its injurious effects. The objection answers itself. Can *New India* suggest a better course to bring about "widespread abstention" than an active Anti-Peace Celebrations Campaign?

The second objection is no doubt a serious one. We wish however that our contemporary had shown how the results of an abstention from the celebrations differ from those of an Anti-Peace-Celebrations campaign, so far as mutual goodwill between Great Britain and India is concerned. The declaration of the gospel of Home Rule by Mrs. Besant and active propaganda to spread the gospel is now part of our proud annals. And we do not yet know whether the Home Rule propaganda has in any way alienated the goodwill of Britain towards India. It has, if at all, had the effect of convincing some of the British people that there is a genuine and keenly felt desire in India for Home Rule. The Anti-Peace Celebrations Campaign, a movement of comparatively much smaller magnitude, by bringing about "widespread abstention" from Celebrations, can only likewise demonstrate to those who care to see it, our capacity for organised action and to make our voice felt. Englishmen would be no Englishmen if they could not appreciate and sympathise with such a righteous and honourable agitation as the Anti-Peace-Celebration movement.

Hamper the Government it will, in so far as the movement succeeds in bringing about withdrawal of co-operation with Government on a sufficiently large scale. But a Government that cares for the co-operation of a community must be prepared to respect its cherished wishes.

As regards Great Britain's virtual helplessness, we are afraid our contemporary is doing an injustice to Britain's capacity to make its will prevail in the councils of the Peace Conference. It has been able to do so in many other respects, and the whole country fears that if Turkey suffers it will do so, only if self-regarding considerations weigh with Britain more than her honour.

We appreciate the fears and apprehensions that prompt the paper to advance the last objection. The Anti-Celebration movement may surely damage our interests and prove a menace to peace if it is carried along improper lines. But we wish the paper had considered what the movement is intended to achieve. It is mainly an educative movement. So far as we know, the Anti-Peace Celebration Committee has published *fatwas*, sent "appeals to co-operate with the Publicity Board, so that the masses be educated, giving reasons why Indians are abstaining from the forthcoming Peace Celebrations." Further "all public workers in the provincial centres are requested to take up work by printing and distributing literature on this subject immediately in Gujrati, Bengali, Hindi, Sindhi, Telugu and Tamil." It will be admitted that publicity work of this nature can be done only by the Anti-Peace Celebration Committee. The *New India* and the English papers cannot reach the masses. And how else but by an active, educative, and publicity

propaganda do we expect to awaken their political consciousness ?

We do not know whether *hartals* will be advised or will be the natural result of the Anti-Peace Celebration propaganda. People can abstain from the celebration both by remaining at home or in their shops. At all events, they have paid dear not long ago for their indiscretions, and they may be trusted not easily to run into them. And after all is said and done, the expression of nervous fears is surely not the way to give our countrymen—making experiments in Self-Government—heart for a successful voyage.

x. The Royal Visit

THE PRINCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*July 7, 1920.*)

Mr. Baptista has written to the *Bombay Chronicle* on the forthcoming visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and has combated views he imputes to me. Much as I should like for the present to observe silence on this delicate subject I cannot allow it to be said of me that I would 'visit the sins of ministers on the Prince'. I entirely agree with Mr. Baptista that the Prince has no voice in the Government and that he is not concerned with the acts of the ministers of the Crown much less with their blunders. I am just as keen as any one could be to give a royal reception to the Prince and it is because

I appreciate the constitution and its working that I would boycott the visit under present conditions. It is because I know that the Royalty is above politics that I would not allow the ministers or the Government of India, if I can help it, to use the Prince for their own political purposes. If I can do nothing else, at least I must not become a tool in the hands of the ministers and the Government of India and allow them, under cover of the Prince's visit, to make their hold on India tighter and to demonstrate to the world that under their benign administration, the whole of India is happy and contented. For let there be no mistake that such will be the result if we remained silent and, under a mistaken sense of loyalty or of the constitution, gave any reception to the Prince. On the contrary I hope that our loyalty requires us to make it clear to His Majesty's ministers that, if they send the Prince to India, we shall be in no mood to join any receptions they might arrange. I would tell them in no veiled language that we are sick at heart over the Khilafat and the Punjab questions and that whilst we are fighting them for very life, we must not be expected to co-operate with them in giving receptions to His Royal Highness. We would be doing a wrong to the public, if we neglected our clear duty of educating them to a truer perception of the meaning of the proposed Royal visit. Let it be known that the Prince will arrive by and with the advice of the ministers, and consent and approval of the Government of India. The visit therefore will be not an act of the Prince but that of the ministers and in boycotting the visit at this juncture, we would be visiting their sins upon themselves and not on the Prince. In other words, we

would not be playing into their hands. Supposing the ministers sent Sir Michael O'Dwyer to replace Lord Chelmsford and he arranged the reception, would Mr. Baptista have us to fall into Sir Michael's trap! Suppose further that he insulted the Punjab under the Prince's nose by ignoring the Punjab leaders, should the Punjab pocket the insult and join the reception because Royalty is above politics! To say so would be to betray a woeful display of ignorance of the meaning of loyalty and politics.

I venture to suggest that if the Australian people were intensely dissatisfied with the acts or the blunders of the ministers in the sense we are, they would boycott the visit without the slightest hesitation. The ministers want to make political capital out of the proposed visit. It is our duty to refuse to let them do so.

Mr Baptista says, and I agree, that we are in mourning. He therefore hopes that the Prince would not be sent, but if he is, Mr. Baptista says, we should give him a welcome in spite of the mourning. I want the Prince to come and therefore I would try to remove the cause of mourning and not take it as a settled fact. I would tell the ministers that, as we want to give the Prince an enthusiastic welcome, they should remove the Khilafat and the Punjab grievances. I should further tell them that, if they did not do so and still persisted in sending the Prince to India, they would be responsible for placing the people in the awkward position of having to boycott the visit or the reception.

WHO IS DISLOYAL ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1920.)

Mr. Montagu has discovered a new definition of disloyalty. He considers my suggestion to boycott the visit of the Prince of Wales to be disloyal and some newspapers taking the cue from him, have called persons who have made the suggestion 'unmannerly'. They have even attributed to these 'unmannerly' persons the suggestion of 'boycotting the Prince'. I draw a sharp and fundamental distinction between boycotting the Prince and boycotting any welcome arranged for him. Personally I would expend the heartiest welcome to His Royal Highness if he came or could come without official patronage and the protecting wings of the Government of the day. Being the heir to a constitutional monarch, the Prince's movements are regulated and dictated by the ministers, no matter how much the dictation may be concealed beneath diplomatically polite language. In suggesting the boycott, therefore, the promoters have suggested boycott of an insolent bureaucracy and dishonest ministers of His Majesty.

You cannot have it both ways. It is true that under a constitutional monarchy, the Royalty is above politics. But you cannot send the Prince on a political visit for the purpose of making political capital out of him, and then complain that those, who will not play your game and, in order to checkmate you, proclaim a boycott of the Royal visit, do not know constitutional usage. For the Prince's visit is

not for pleasure. His Royal Highness is to come, in Mr. Lloyd George's words, as the "ambassador of the British nation," in other words, his own ambassador, in order to issue a certificate of merit to him and possibly to give the ministers a new lease of life. The visit is designed to consolidate and strengthen a power that spells mischief for India. Even as it is, Mr. Montagu has foreseen that the welcome will probably be excelled by any hitherto extended to Royalty, meaning that the people are not really and deeply affected and stirred by the official atrocities in the Punjab and the manifestly dishonest breach of official declarations on the Khilafat. With the knowledge that India was bleeding at heart, the Government of India should have told His Majesty's ministers that the moment was inopportune for sending the Prince. I venture to submit that it is adding insult to injury to bring the Prince and through his visit to steal honours and further prestige for a Government that deserves to be dismissed with disgrace. I claim that I prove my loyalty by saying that India is in no mood, is too deeply in mourning, to take part in any welcome to His Royal Highness, and that the ministers and the Indian Government show their disloyalty by making the Prince a cat's-paw of their deep political game. If they persist, it is the clear duty of India to have nothing to do with the visit.*

* *Young India* of August 4, 1920, wrote :—

What is in a Name?—A writer in the *Times of India* the other day twitted Mr. Gandhi for approving boycott of the Prince's visit whilst he disapproved of boycott of British goods. Here there is a clear confusion of terms due perhaps to our having to write in a foreign language. The writer has overlooked the fact that Mr. Gandhi need not disapprove of all

MINISTERIAL SUBTERFUGE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 20, 1920.)

The visit of the Prince of Wales having been postponed, for reasons of health, the King's uncle, the Duke of Connaught, will arrive early December next to carry out the work of inauguration of the Reformed Councils. But the boycott of the Councils by popular leaders being very nearly complete, the function of the Regal deputy loses all its significance from the people's point of view. The Royal visit at this time is not however intended to perform this formal function only. The British ministers and the Government of India indeed mean through the

boycott because he disapproves of boycott of British goods. He does for instance attempt to boycott, and often succeeds in boycotting, untruth and evil. He does boycott all foreign cloth for his own use. Boycott of British goods is bad because it is conceived in a punitive spirit and has no reference to any permanent principle of life such as Swadeshi. Boycott of British goods means war with the nation whereas Mr. Gandhi is engaged in a war with the Government of the day, and boycott of British goods means introduction of Japanese and other foreign goods, and therefore complications in our economics and possible difficulties with these foreign powers. Boycott moreover being a form of punishment, must be immediate and extensive to be effective. People are not ready for it. Hence Mr. Gandhi's opposition to such boycott. But boycott of the Prince's visit has no idea of punishment behind it. It is merely a refusal to co-operate with the authorities who have for their own ends arranged the visit in order to tighten their hold on India and to gain from the civilised world a 'certificate of merit' as Mr. Gandhi calls it. Boycott of the Prince's visit therefore becomes a duty imposed upon all who value national honour and who wish to make it clear to the authorities that they are in no way to expect help from the people in increasing their power to do evil.

Duke's reception here to certify to the world the popularity of their Government. If then our protests against Governmental crimes are sincere, we must see that this crafty subterfuge fails. Our virtues of hospitality and loyalty which are really above suspicion should not be allowed to be misconstrued into contentment or servility. It should not be forgotten that we are often held to ridicule for our extravagant ideas about loyalty. An eminent writer from the 'Round Table' group has contrasted our ideas of monarchy with enlightened British notions. We hold monarchy as a divine institution, a sacred office, whereas, says that writer, they in England regard the King as the hereditary president of a commonwealth. To our ignorance of this British notion of loyalty, all our loyal demonstrations, made in and out of season, are attributed. It will be an exhibition of a sad want of reasonableness and courage in us if we receive or join in receiving the Duke of Connaught with hospitalities which the Royal visits have in the past commanded from us. When we are groaning under the insults the British ministers have heaped on us, how can it consistently lie in our mouth to say a word of welcome to the Duke whom those very ministers have urged to sail to India ? This is not the first time that such a use is made of the Royal family to sugar over the devilish deeds of ministers. A similar attempt was made in the case of Ireland in 1885. And Mr. Parnell's opinion on this occasion is of striking interest. He wrote to the *United Ireland* :

"You ask for my views regarding the visit of the Prince of Wales. In reply I desire to say that if the usages of

the constitution existed in Ireland as they do in England, there would, to my judgment, be no inconsistency in those who believe in the limited monarchy as the best form of government taking a suitable part in the reception of the Prince. But in view of the fact that the constitution has never been administered in Ireland according to its spirit and precedents, that the power of the Crown as wielded by Earl Spencer and other Viceroys is despotic and unlimited to the last degree, and that in the present instance the Royal personage is to be used by the two English political parties in Ireland for the purpose of injuring and insulting the Nationalist party and of impeding if possible their work, I fail to see upon what ground it can be claimed from any lover of constitutional government under a limited monarchy that the Prince is entitled to a reception from the independent and patriotic people of Ireland, or to any recognition of officials, and landowners and place hunters who fatten upon the poverty and misfortunes of the country. Let me suggest a parallel. Would it be tolerated in England for a moment if the Government for their own party purposes, on the eve of a general election, were to use the Prince of Wales as an electioneering agent in any section of the country, and were to send him upon a royal progress in order to embarrass their political opponents? The breach of constitutional privilege becomes still graver when we consider that it is the march of a nation which is now sought to be impeded in fruition of a long struggle and of many sacrifices which the adventitious aid of this royal visit is enlisted to injure. I have, however every confidence that our people

having been suitably forewarned, will not allow their hospitable nature and cordial disposition to carry them into any attitude which might be taken as one of condonation for the past, or satisfaction with present state of affairs."

We too feel sure to repeat what Parnell said of his countrymen. Our people also having been forewarned, nay forearmed, by boycotting the very constitution which the Duke is coming to inaugurate, will respectfully but firmly not allow their hospitable nature and cordial disposition to carry them into any attitude which might be taken as one of condonation for the past unmitigated wrongs, or satisfaction with the present state of affairs. *

* Again on December 1, 1920, Mr Gandhi wrote in *Young India* as follows:—

The Duke's Visit—His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught will be soon in our midst. It is a matter of great sorrow to me that I should have to advise a complete boycott of all public functions held in his honour. He is personally an amiable English gentleman. But in my humble opinion, public interest demands that this official visit should be strictly ignored. His Royal Highness comes to sustain a corrupt system of government, he comes to whitewash an irresponsible bureaucracy, he comes to make us forget the unforgettable, he comes not to heal the wounds inflicted upon us, but to mock us by flinging deceptive reforms at us. To welcome His Royal Highness is to associate with him in promoting our own dishonour. No government official, whether he be European or Indian, has a right to claim any welcome or honour from us so long as the government, whose power he represents, remains unrepentant and unresponsive to the one thing needful.

TO H. R. H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT

(February 9, 1921.)

The following letter, which has appeared in the Press, was sent by Mr. Gandhi to H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught last week:—

Sir,—Your Royal Highness must have heard a great deal about non-co-operation, non-co-operationists, and their methods, and, incidentally, of me, its humble author. I fear that the information given your Royal Highness must have been in its nature one-sided. I owe it to you, to my friends and myself, that I should place before you what I conceive to be the scope of non-co operation, as followed not only by me, but my closest associates, such as Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali.

For me it is no joy and pleasure to be actively associated in the boycott of Your Royal Highness' visit. I have tendered loyal, voluntary assistance to the Government for an unbroken period of nearly 30 years in the full belief that through that lay the path of freedom for my country. It was, therefore, no slight thing for me to suggest to my countrymen that we should take no part in welcoming Your Royal Highness. Not one amongst us has anything against you as an English gentleman. We hold your person as sacred as that of a dearest friend. I do not know any of my friends who would not guard it with his life if he found it in danger.

We are not at war with individual Englishmen. We seek not to destroy English life. We do desire to destroy the system that has emasculated our country in body, mind and soul. We are determined to battle with all

our might against that in English nature which has made O'Dwyerism and Dyerism possible in the Punjab and has resulted in a wanton affront upon Islam, a faith professed by seven crores of our countrymen. We consider it inconsistent with our self-respect any longer to brook the spirit of superiority and dominance which has systematically ignored and disregarded the sentiments of thirty crores of innocent people of India on many a vital matter. It is humiliating to us. It cannot be a matter of pride to you that thirty crores of Indians should live day in and day out in fear of their lives from one hundred thousand Englishmen and, therefore, be under subjection to them.

Your Royal Highness has come, not to end the system I described, but to sustain it by upholding its prestige. Your first pronouncement was a laudation of Lord Willingdon. I have the privilege of knowing him. I believe him to be an honest, amiable gentleman, who will not willingly hurt even a fly, but he certainly failed as a ruler. He allowed himself to be guided by those whose interest it was to support their power. He is not reading the mind of the Dravidian provinces. Here, in Bengal, you are issuing a certificate of merit to a Governor who is again, from all I have heard, an estimable gentleman, but who knows nothing of the heart of Bengal and its yearnings. Bengal is not Calcutta. Fort William and the palaces of Calcutta represent an insolent exploitation of the unmurmuring and highly cultured peasantry of this fair province.

The non-co-operationists have come to the conclusion that they must not be deceived by the reforms that tinker with the problem of India's distress and humiliation, nor

must they be impatient and angry. We must not in our impatient anger resort to stupid violence. We freely admit that we must take our due share of blame for the existing state. It is not so much British guns that are responsible for our subjection as our voluntary co-operation.

Our non-co-operation in a hearty welcome to Your Royal Highness is thus in no sense a demonstration against your high personage, but it is against the system you come to uphold. I know individual Englishmen cannot, even if they will, alter the English nature all of a sudden. If we would be the equals of Englishmen, we must cast off fear. We must learn to be self-reliant and independent of schools, courts, protection, and patronage of a Government we seek to end, if it will not mend.

Hence this non-violent non-co-operation. I know we have not all yet become non-violent in speech and deed, but the results so far achieved have, I assure Your Royal Highness, been amazing. The people have understood the secret and value of non-violence as they have never done before. He, who will, may see that this is a religious, purifying movement. We are leaving off drink. We are trying to rid India of the curse of untouchability. We are trying to throw off foreign tinsel splendour, and by reverting to the spinning wheel, reviving the ancient and poetic simplicity of life. We hope thereby to sterilize the existing harmful institutions.

I ask Your Royal Highness as an Englishman to study this movement and its possibilities for the empire and the world. We are at war with nothing that is good in the

world. In protecting Islam in the manner we are, we are protecting all religions, in protecting the honour of India, we are protecting the honour of humanity. For our means are hurtful to none. We desire to live on terms of friendship with Englishmen, but that friendship must be friendship of equals both in theory and in practice, and we must continue to non-co-operate, *i. e.*, to purify ourselves till the goal is achieved. I ask Your Royal Highness, and through you, every Englishman, to appreciate the view-point of non-co-operation.

I beg to remain,
Your Royal Highness' Faithful Servant,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

HONOUR THE PRINCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 27, 1921.)

The reader must not be surprised at the title of this writing. Supposing that the Prince was a blood brother in a high place, supposing that he was to be exploited by neighbours for their own base ends, supposing further that he was in the hands of my neighbours, that my voice could not effectively reach him and that he was being brought to my village by the said neighbours, would I not honour him best by dissociating myself from all the ceremonial that might be arranged in his 'honour' in the process of exploitation and by letting him know, by every means at my disposal, that he was being exploited? Would

I not be a traitor to him if I did not warn him against entering the trap prepared for him by my neighbours ?

I have no manner of doubt that the Prince's visit * is being exploited for advertising the 'benign' British rule in India. It is a crime against us if His Royal Highness is being brought for personal pleasure and sport when India is seething with discontent, when the masses are saturated with disaffection towards the system under which they are governed, when famine is raging in Khulna and the Ceded Districts and when armed conflict is raging in Malabar; it is a crime against India to spend millions of rupees on a mere show when millions of men are living in a state of chronic starvation. Eight lacs of

* In *Young India* of July 6, 1921, Mr. Gandhi wrote on the Prince's proposed visit as follows —

It is a great pity that the talk of the Prince's visit has been revived and a provisional date fixed India will refuse to welcome a representative of a system of which she is sick unto death. And if his visit is forced upon an unwilling India, there must be the same effective *harai* on the day of His Royal Highness's visit that there was on the Duke's visit. I repeat once more that non-co-operators have nothing against the Prince as a man. But he cannot be divested of the office he holds. Whilst it is true that the king and his heirs do not actively meddle in the affairs of state (which is a convenience for the state), he is as effectual a representative of the existing system of Government as the most meddlesome prime minister or Viceroy. I am disposed to think that as a supporter of the institution, he is more effective by reason of his isolation. If the Prince comes, he will not come to bless the non-co-operators or their cause, but to sing the song of praise for a Government which is responsible for the dishonour of the Punjab, for breach of faith with the Mussalmans, for forcing the drink traffic on India, for impoverishing her and for so emasculating her that she almost thinks she must remain in slavery for an unthinkable time. In my humble opinion, the projected visit will be an insult added to injury. And it will be the duty of every non-co-operator, respectfully but firmly and in no unmistakable manner, to express his strong disapproval of all such efforts to bolster up a system which is a tottering to its fall.

rupees have been voted away by the Bombay Council alone for the pageant.

The visit is being heralded by repression in the land. In Sindh over fifty-six non-co-operators are in gaol. Some of the bravest of Mussalmans are being tried for holding certain opinions. Nineteen Bengal workers have been just imprisoned including Mr. Sengupta, the leading Barrister of the place. A Mussalman Pir and three other selfless workers are already in gaol for a similar 'crime'. Several leaders of Karnatak are also imprisoned, and now its chief man is on trial for saying what I have said repeatedly in these columns and what Congressmen have been saying all over during the past twelve months. Several leaders of the Central Provinces have been similarly deprived of their liberty. A most popular doctor, Dr. Paranjpye, a man universally respected for his selflessness, is suffering rigorous imprisonment like a common felon. I have by no means exhausted the list of imprisonments of non-co-operators. Whether they are a test of real crime or an answer to growing disaffection, the Prince's visit is, to say the least, most inopportune. There is no doubt that the people do not want His Royal Highness to visit India at the present juncture. They have expressed their opinion in no uncertain terms. They have declared that Bombay should observe *hartal* on the day of his landing at Bombay. It is a clear imposition upon the people to bring the Prince in the teeth of their opposition.

What are we to do in the circumstances? We must organise a complete boycott of all functions held in the Prince's honour. We must religiously refrain from attending charities, fetes or fireworks

organised for the purpose. We must refuse to illuminate or to send our children to see the organised illuminations. To this end we must publish leaflets by the million and distribute them amongst the people telling them what their duty in the matter is and it would be true honour done to the Prince if Bombay on the day of his landing wears the appearance of a deserted city.

But we must isolate the Prince from the person. We have no ill-will against the Prince as man. He probably knows nothing of the feeling in India, he probably knows nothing about repression. Equally probably he is ignorant of the fact that the Punjab wound is still bleeding, that the treachery towards India in the matter of the Khilafat is still rankling in every Indian breast, and that on the Government's own admission the reformed councils contain members who, though nominally elected, do not in any sense represent even the few lacs who are on the electoral rolls. To do or to attempt to do any harm to the person of the Prince would be not only cruel and inhuman, but it would be on our part a piece of treachery towards ourselves and him, for we have voluntarily pledged ourselves to be and remain non-violent. Any injury or insult to the Prince by us will be a greater wrong done by us to Islam and India than any the English have done. They know no better. We can lay no such claim to ignorance, we have with our eyes open and before God and man, promised not to hurt a single individual in any way connected with the system we are straining every nerve to destroy. It must therefore be our duty to take every precaution to protect his person as our own from all harm.

In spite of all our effort, we know that there will be some who would want to take part in the various functions from fear or hope or choice. They have as much right to do what they like as we have to do what we like. That is the test of the freedom we wish to have and enjoy. Let us whilst we are being subjected by an insolent bureaucracy to a severe irritation, exercise the greatest restraint. And if we can exhibit our firm resolve to have nothing to do with it by dissociating ourselves from its pageant at the same time that we show forbearance towards those who differ from us, we would advance our cause in a most effective manner.

GOOD AND BAD

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 24, 1921.)

[Non-co-operators all over India had made arrangements to boycott the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. On the day of the landing of the Prince in Bombay, (November 17, 1921), Bombay observed hartal and suspension of work. But owing to the activities of some mischievous elements, a great riot took place there in which all parties suffered. Mr Gandhi who was then in Bombay, witnessed the scene of the riots and wrote a series of soul-stirring letters to the various parties in the city and with the help of the leaders of all parties soon restored peace in the city.]

The reader will appreciate the statement that during these four days I have been receiving accounts both good and bad. Non-co-operators injured! Hindus and Mussalmans assaulting Parsis! Parsis shooting them! Christians assaulting those wearing *Khadi* caps or dress! Hindus and Mussalmans assaulting Christians! These bits

of information are interspersed with the news that Parsis are saving Hindus and Mussalmans from the other Parsis, some Christians saving Hindus and Mussalmans, the latter sheltering both, non-co-operators at great peril to their lives seeking to bring about peace. It has never been my misfortune to be torn between two powerful and conflicting emotions. And then to guide friends in such a difficult situation, to send them to enter the jaws of Death and yet for me to avoid death ! It is the fast that has been my outward staff and it is heart prayer that has been my inward strength. On the 17th I felt as if all my strength had vanished. Why was I unable permanently to influence the crowd ? Where was the power of *Ahimsa* in me ? What was I to do ? I could not, I would not, ask the aggrieved parties to seek Government aid. We had no Panchayats to deal out justice. There was no one I could approach who could bring about peace. I could not and would not organise a trained physical force party. What relief could I give to the sufferers from mob violence ? If I allowed myself to be torn to pieces by justly incensed Parsis or Christians, I would only give rise to greater bloodshed. Whilst as a soldier I must avoid no unavoidable risk, I must not recklessly run the risk of being killed. Then what was I to do ? At last came the fast to my rescue to soothe my soul. If I may not give myself to be killed through human agency, I must give myself to God to be taken away by refusing to eat till He heard my prayer. For me a bankrupt that was the only thing left. I could not draw upon the people from their innocence. They dishonoured the cheque I presented personally on the 17th. I must now somehow

or other recoup lost credit or die in the attempt. I must draw upon God for further credit to enable me to transact His business. I could only do so by humbling myself, crawling in the dust before Him, denying myself the food He has given. I must in a thousand ways show Him that I am in earnest, and if I am not found worthy to conduct His business, ask Him to recall me and refashion me according to my worth and His will. And so I have taken up the fast. The news of the hurt received by co-workers or the hurt received by the combatants no longer perturbs me. For me there is only my own non-violence as my help. If it does not answer, I must not worry. Thousands die in other parts of India and their deaths trouble me but do not worry me. Even so in this case if I could but do all I know, I need not *then* fret and fume. This fast then has been to me a penance, purification and reparation. It is also a warning to workers that they may not play with me in the movement. Only those who believe in non-violence need remain in the struggle. It could be conducted without difficulty and complications by a few staunch and true workers. It can only be harmed by insincere workers though many. Lastly it is a remedy for hastening peace. But the last is the derivative end. It comes as a result of penance, purification and reparation. It is the credit sent by God.

* * *

I am receiving remonstrances against the fast. Some have taken up sympathetic fast. I assure all these that they are wrong. For me fast was a necessity. I was the guilty party, I was the bankrupt. The business of the others is to understand the situation, to rid themselves of

violence if any, to spread non-violence among others and believe that the slightest violence must injure the cause. They must take up the *Charkha*, they must promote not merely Hindu-Muslim unity but they must now promote unity among all communities. Hindu-Muslim unity is not worth a day's purchase if it does not prefer the interests of smaller communities to its own. Christians and Jews in India are not foreigners, nor are Parsis. We must go out of our way to be friendly to them and to serve and help them, above all to protect them from harm from ourselves. The workers must similarly make friends with co-operators. They must not speak ill of them whether they are English or Indian. We must believe in the truth of our cause and in our capacity for self-suffering. We have, at any rate for the time being, announced to the world in the name of God, that we do not propose to harm any Englishman no matter what he does to us. We shall be guilty before God and man if under the cover of our pledge we injure a single English or Indian co-operator.

Friends have misunderstood the meaning of the peace that I have referred to in my second appeal. The peace I want has to be made by non-co-operators. It does not mean surrender of principle or policy so as to find a common platform for work. That in my opinion is an impossible task, for the methods of the various groups are so radically different. When one party finds it for the good of the country to enter the councils and another to abstain, there is no meeting ground. But because we differ from one another, we need not behave indecently towards one another, nor need we break one another's

heads. The creed of non-violence, while it persists, requires us not to retaliate. I am convinced that, if we can produce an atmosphere of toleration, we can extend our scope limitlessly. To-day we are caged by our own doubts and suspicions. We are not sure that the thousands who flock to our meetings will observe non-violence. If we were not so popular, we should make much greater progress than we have made hitherto. And for this, goodwill on our part towards our opponents is an absolute necessity. Let us not talk of the errors and omissions of the Government or its supporters. Let us dispassionately devote our energy, our speeches, writings and action to the working out of our own programme. Let us attain control over the rowdiest element, and we can establish Swaraj immediately.

A DEEP STAIN

(November 24, 1921.)

[Under the above heading Mr. Gandhi published the following note after having witnessed the unfortunate disturbances in Bombay:—]

The reputation of Bombay, the hope of my dreams, was being stained yesterday even whilst in my simplicity. I was congratulating the citizens upon their non-violence in the face of provocation. For the volunteers with their captain were arrested during the previous night for pasting posters under authority on private property. The posters advised the people to boycott the welcome to the Prince. They were destroyed. The Swaraj Sabha's office was

mysteriously entered and the unused posters, so far as I am aware not declared unlawful, were also removed. The Prince's visit itself and the circumstances attending the ceremonials arranged and public money wasted for the manufacture of a welcome to His Royal Highness constituted an unbearable provocation. And yet Bombay had remained self-restrained. This, I thought, was a matter for congratulation. The burning of the pile of foreign cloth was an eloquent counter-demonstration to the interested official demonstration.

Little did I know that at the very time that the Prince was passing through the decorated route and the pile of foreign cloth was burning, in another part of the city the mill hands were in criminal disobedience of the wishes of their masters emptying them, first one and then the others, by force, that a swelling mob was molesting peaceful passengers in the tramcars and holding up the tram traffic, that it was forcibly depriving those that were wearing foreign caps of their head-dresses and pelting inoffensive Europeans. As the day went up the fury of the mob now intoxicated with its initial success rose also. They burnt tramcars and a motor, smashed liquor shops and burnt two.

I heard of the outbreak at about 1 o'clock. I motored with some friends to the area of disturbance and heard the most painful and the most humiliating story of molestation of Parsi sisters. Some few were assaulted, and even had their *sadis* torn from them. No one from among a crowd of over fifteen hundred who had surrounded my car denied the charge, as a Parsi with hot rage and quivering lips was with the greatest deliberation relating the

story. An elderly Parsi gentleman said, "Please save us from this mob rule." This news of the rough handling of Parsi sisters pierced me like a dart. I felt that my sisters or daughters had been hurt by a violent mob! Yes, some Parsis had joined the welcome. They had a right to hold their own view free of molestation. There can be no coercion in Swaraj. The Moplah fanatic who forcibly converts a Hindu believes that he is acquiring religious merit. A non-co-operator or his associate who uses coercion has no apology whatsoever for his criminality.

As I reached the Two Tanks, I found a liquor shop smashed, two policemen badly wounded and lying unconscious on cots without anybody caring for them. I alighted. Immediately the crowd surrounded me and yelled "Mahatma Gandhiki jai." That sound usually grates on my ears, but it has grated never so much as it did yesterday when the crowd unmindful of the two sick brethren choked me with the shout at the top of their voices. I rebuked them and they were silent. Water was brought for the two wounded men. I requested two of my companions, and some from the crowd to take the dying policemen to the hospital. I proceeded then to the scene a little further up where I saw a fire rising. There were two tramcars which were burnt by the crowd. On returning, I witnessed a burning motor car. I appealed to the crowd to disperse, told them that they had damaged the cause of the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. I returned sick at heart and in a chastened mood.

At about five, a few brave Sindhi young men came to report that in Bhindi Bazaar the crowd was molesting

every passer-by who had a foreign cap on and even seriously beating him, if he refused to give up his cap. A brave old Parsi who defied the crowd and would not give up his *Pugree* was badly handled. Maulana Azad Sobhani and I went to Bhindi Bazaar and reasoned with the crowd, told them that they were denying their religion by hurting innocent men. The crowd made a show of dispersing. The Police were there but they were exceedingly restrained. We went further and, on retracing our steps, found to our horror a liquor shop on fire. Even the fire brigade was obstructed in its work. Thanks to the efforts of Pandit Nekiram Sharma and others, the inmates of the shop were able to come out.

The crowd did not consist of hooligans only or boys. It was not an unintelligent crowd. They were not all mill hands. It was essentially a mixed crowd unprepared and unwilling to listen to anybody. For the moment it had lost its head. And it was not a crowd but several crowds numbering in all not less than twenty thousand. It was bent upon mischief and destruction.

I heard that there was firing resulting in deaths and that in the Anglo-Indian quarters every one came in for hard beating, if he did not put off his *Khadi* cap or shirt. I heard that many were seriously injured. I am writing this in the midst of six Hindu and Mussalman workers who have just come in with broken heads and bleeding and one with a broken nasal bone and other lacerated wounds and in danger of losing his life. They went to Parel led by Maulanas Azad Sobhani and Mozzam Ali to pacify the mill hands, who, it was reported, were holding up tramcars there. The workers, however, were unable

to proceed to their destination. They returned with their bleeding wounds to speak for themselves.

Thus the hope of reviving mass Civil Disobedience has once more in my opinion been dashed to pieces. The atmosphere for mass Civil Disobedience is absent. It is not enough to say that such an atmosphere is to be found in Bardoli, and, therefore, it may go on side by side with the violence in Bombay. This is impossible. Neither Bardoli nor Bombay can be treated as separate, unconnected units. They are parts of one great indivisible whole. It was possible to isolate Malabar. It was also possible to disregard Malegaon. But it is not possible to ignore Bombay.

Non-co-operators cannot escape liability. It is true that non-co-operators were ceaselessly remonstrating everywhere with the people at considerable risk to themselves, to arrest or stop the mischief and that they are responsible for saving many precious lives. But that is not enough for launching out on Civil Disobedience or to discharge us from liability for the violence that has taken place. We claim to have established a peaceful atmosphere, *i.e.*, to have attained by our non-violence sufficient control over the people to keep their violence under check. We have failed when we ought to have succeeded. For yesterday was a day of our trial. We were under our pledge bound to protect the person of the Prince from any harm or insult. And we broke that pledge inasmuch as any one of us insulted or injured a single European or any other who took part in the welcome as we were to refrain. Nor can I shirk my own personal responsibility. I am more instrumental than any other in bring-

ing into being the spirit of revolt. I find myself not fully capable of controlling and disciplining that spirit. I must do penance for it. For me the struggle is essentially religious. I believe in fasting and prayer, and I propose henceforth to observe every Monday a twenty-four hours' fast till Swaraj is attained.

The Working Committee will have to devote its attention to the situation and consider in the light thereof whether mass Civil Disobedience can be at all encouraged until we have obtained complete control over the masses. I have personally come deliberately to the conclusion that mass Civil Disobedience cannot be started for the present. I confess my inability to conduct a campaign of Civil Disobedience to successful issue unless a completely non-violent spirit is generated among the people. I am sorry for the conclusion. It is a humiliating confession of my incapacity, but I know that I shall appear more pleasing to my Maker by being what I am instead of appearing to be what I am not. If I can have nothing to do with the organised violence of the Government, I can have less to do with the unorganised violence of the people. I would prefer to be crushed between the two.

APPEAL TO BOMBAY CITIZENS

(November 24, 1921.)

Men and Women of Bombay,

It is not possible to describe to you the agony I have suffered during the past two days. I am writing this now at 3-30 a. m. in perfect peace. After two hours' prayer and meditation I have found it.

I must refuse to eat or drink anything but water till the Hindus and Mussalmans of Bombay have made peace with the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews, and till the non-co-operators have made peace with the co-operators.

The Swaraj that I have witnessed during the last two days has stunk in my nostrils. Hindu-Muslim unity has been a menace to the handful of Parsis, Christians and Jews. The non-violence of non-co-operators has been worse than the violence of co-operators. For with non-violence on our lips we have terrorized those who have differed from us and in so doing we have denied our God. There is only one God for us all whether we find him through the Koran, the Bible, the Zend Avesta, the Talmud, or the Gita. And He is God of Truth and Love. I have no interest in living save for proving this faith in me. I cannot hate an Englishman or any one else. I have spoken and written much against his institutions, especially the one he has set up in India. I shall continue to do so if I live. But you must not mistake my condemnation of the system for that of the man. My religion requires me to love him as I love myself. I would deny God if I did not attempt to prove it at this critical moment.

And the Parsis? I have meant every word I have said about them. Hindus and Mussalmans will be unworthy of freedom if they do not defend them and their honour with their lives. They have only recently proved their liberality and friendship. The Mussalmans are especially beholden to them, for the Parsis have, compared to their numbers, given more than they themselves to the Khilafat funds. Unless Hindus and Mussalmans have expressed full

and free repentance, I cannot face again the appealing eyes of Parsi men and women that I saw on the 17th instant as I passed through them. Nor can I face Andrews when he returns from East Africa if we have done no reparation to the Indian Christians whom we are bound to protect as our own brothers and sisters. We may not think of what they or the Parsis in self-defence or by way of reprisals have done to some of us.

You can see quite clearly that I must do the utmost reparation to this handful of men and women who have been the victims of forces that have come into being largely through my instrumentality. I invite every Hindu and Mussalman to do likewise. But I do not want any one to fast. Fasting is only good when it comes in answer to prayer and as a felt yearning of the soul. I invite every Hindu and Mussalman to retire to his home, ask God for forgiveness and to befriend the injured communities from the bottom of his heart.

I invite my fellow workers not to waste a single word of sympathy for me. I need or deserve none. But I invite them to make a ceaseless effort to regain control over the turbulent elements. This is a terribly true struggle. There is no room for sham or humbug in it. Before we can make any further progress with our struggle we must cleanse our hearts.

One special word to my Mussalman brothers. I have approached the Khilafat as a sacred cause. I have striven for Hindu-Muslim unity because India cannot live free without it and because we would both deny God if we considered one another as natural enemies. I have thrown myself into the arms of the Ali brothers because I believe

them to be true, and God-fearing men. The Mussalmans have to my knowledge played the leading part during the two days of carnage. It has deeply hurt me. I ask every Mussalman worker to rise to his full height, to realize his duty to his faith and see that the carnage stops.

May God bless every one of us with wisdom and courage to do the right at any cost.

19th November 1921.

I am,
Your Servant,
M. K. GANDHI.

AN APPEAL TO THE MAVALIS

(November 24, 1921.)

To the Mavalis of Bombay.

The most terrible mistake I have made is, that I thought non-co-operators had acquired influence over you and that you had understood the relative value, the political wisdom of non-violence though not the moral necessity of it. I had thought that you had sufficiently understood the interests of your country not to meddle with the movement to its detriment and that therefore you would have wisdom enough not to give way to your worst passions. But it cuts me to the quick to find that you have used the mass awakening for your own lust for plunder, rapine and even indulging in your worst animal appetite. Whether you call yourself a Hindu, Mussalman, Parsi, Christian or Jew, you have certainly failed to consider even your own religious interests. Some of my friends would, I know, accuse me of ignorance of human

nature. If I believed the charge, I would plead guilty and retire from human assemblies and return only after acquiring knowledge of human nature. But I know that I had no difficulty in controlling even the Indian Mavalis in South Africa. I was able because I had succeeded in approaching them through co-workers where I had no personal contact with them. In your case I see now that we have failed to reach you. I do not believe you to be incapable of responding to the noble call of religion and country.

See what you have done! The Hindu and Mussalman Mavalis have violated the sanctity of Parsi temples, and they have exposed their own to similar risk from the wrath of Parsi Mavalis. Because some Parsis have chosen to partake in the welcome to the Prince, the Hindu and Mussalman Mavalis have roughly handled every Parsi they have met. The result has been, that the Parsi Mavalis have now turned their attention to Hindus and Mussalmans. Certainly the Parsi Mavalis are less to blame. Hindu and Mussalman Mavalis have rudely, roughly and insolently removed the foreign cloth worn by some Parsis and Christians, forgetting that not all Hindus and all Mussalmans, nor by any means even a majority of them, have religiously discarded the use of foreign cloth. The Parsi and the Christian Mavalis are therefore interfering with the Hindu and Mussalman wearers of *Khadi*. Thus we are all moving in a vicious circle, and the country suffers.

I write this not to blame but to warn you and to confess that we have grievously neglected you. I am doing the penance in one way. The other workers are

doing it in another way. Messrs. Azad Sobani, Jayakar, Jamnadas, Mehta, Sathe, Moazam Ali and many others have been risking their lives in bringing under control this unfortunate ebullition. Shrimati Sarojini Naidu has fearlessly gone in your midst to reason with you and appeal to you. Our work in your midst has only just begun. Will you not give us a chance by stopping the mad process of retaliation? The Hindus and the Mussalmans should be ashamed to take reprisals against the Parsis or the Christians. The latter must know it to be suicidal to battle against Hindu and Mussalman ferocity by brute strength. The result is they must seek the assistance of an alien government, *i. e.*, sell their freedom. Surely the best course for them is to realize their nationality and believe that the reasoning Hindus and Mussalmans must and will protect the interests of minorities before their own. Anyway the problem before Bombay is to ensure the absolute protection of the minorities and the acquisition of control over the rowdy element. And I shall trust that you, the Mavalis of Bombay, will now restrain your hand and give a chance to the workers who are desirous of serving you. May God help you.

I am,
Your friend,
M. K. GANDHI.

TO CO-WORKERS

(November 24, 1921.)

Comrades,

Past few days have been a fiery ordeal for us, and God is to be thanked that some of us have not been found

wanting. The broken heads before me and the dead bodies of which I have heard on unimpeachable authority, are sufficient evidence of the fact. Workers have lost their lives or limbs, or have suffered bruises in the act of preserving peace, of weaning mad countrymen from their wrath. These deaths and injuries show that, in spite of the error of many of our countrymen, some of us are prepared to die for the attainment of our goal. If all of us had imbibed the spirit of non-violence, or if some had and the others had remained passive, no blood need have been spilt. But it was not to be. Some must therefore voluntarily give their blood in order that bloodless atmosphere may be created. So long as there are people weak enough to do violence, there will be others weak enough to seek the aid of those who have superior skill or means for doing it. And that is why the Parsis and the Christians sought and received the assistance of the Government such that the Government openly took sides, and armed and aided the latter in retaliatory madness, and criminally neglected to protect a single life among those, who though undoubtedly guilty in the first instance were the victims of the pardonable wrath of the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews. The Government has thus appeared in its nakedness as a party doing violence not merely to preserve peace, but to sustain the aggressive violence of its injured supporters. Its police and military looked on with callous indifference whilst the Christians in their justifiable indignation deprived innocent men of their white caps and hammered those who would not surrender them, or whilst the Parsis assaulted or shot, not in self-defence but because the

victims happened to be Hindus or Mussalmans or non-co-operators. I can excuse the aggrieved Parsis and Christians, but can find no excuse for the criminal conduct of the police and the military in taking sides.

So the task before the workers is to take the blows from the Government and our erring countrymen. This is the only way open to us of sterilising the forces of violence. The way to immediate Swaraj lies through our gaining control over the forces of violence, and that not by greater violence but by moral influence. We must see as clearly as daylight, that it is impossible for us to be trained and armed for violence effective enough for displacing the existing Government.

Some people imagine that after all we could not have better advertised our indignation against the welcome to the Prince than by letting loose the mob frenzy on the fateful Seventeenth. This reasoning betrays at once ignorance and weakness, ignorance of the fact that our goal was not injury to the welcome, and weakness because we still hanker after advertising our strength to others instead of being satisfied with the consciousness of its possession. I wish I could convince every one that we materially retarded our progress to our triple goal.

But all is not lost if the workers realise and act up to their responsibility. We must secure the full co-operation of the rowdies of Bombay. We must know the mill hands. They must either work for the Government or for us, *i. e.*, for violence or against it. There is no middle way. They must not interfere with us. They must either be amenable to our love or helplessly submit to the bayonet. They may not seek shelter under the banner of

non-violence for the purpose of doing violence. And in order to carry our message to them, we must reach every mill hand individually and let him understand and appreciate the struggle. Similarly we must reach the rowdy element, befriend them and help them to understand the religious character of the struggle. We must neither neglect them nor pander to them. We must become their servants.+

The peace that we are aiming at is not a patched up peace. We must have fair guarantees of its continuance without the aid of the Government, sometimes even in spite of its activity to the contrary. There must be a heart union between Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis, Christians and Jews. The three latter communities may and will distrust the other two. The recent occurrences must strengthen that distrust. We must go out of our way to conquer their distrust. We must not molest them if they do not become full non-co-operators or do not adopt Swadeshi or the white *Khadi* cap which has become its

* The following appeal signed by representatives of all communities was issued to the public .—

The citizens of Bombay will be glad to learn that thanks to the concerted efforts of Hindu, Mussalman and Parsi leaders, peace has been restored in most parts of the town. From morning till night they went about in the town, in carriages, pleading with people to be quiet and to preserve peace, and the latter responded to their appeals. Some excitement still, no doubt, prevails in a few localities. Every one should endeavour to restore quiet in those parts. It behoves us all to forgive and forget the errors of one another. Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis, Christians and Jews, who have their homes in India, ought to live as brothers and sisters and bear with the differences and failings of one another. We have all to be ashamed of the strain on the fair name of Bombay. Only by restoring and preserving peace can that stain be wiped out, and we appeal to all the citizens of Bombay for hearty co-operation in the matter.

symbol. We must not be irritated against them even if they side with the Government on every occasion. We have to make them ours by right of loving service. This is the necessity of our situation. The alternative is a civil war. And a civil war, with a third power only too happy to consolidate itself by siding now with the one and then with the other, must be held an impossibility for the near future.

And what is true of the smaller communities is also true of the co-operators. We must not be impatient with or intolerant to them. We are bound to recognise their freedom to co-operate with the Government if we claim the freedom to non-co-operate. What would we have felt if we were in a minority and the co-operators being in a majority had used violence against us? Non-co-operation *cum* non-violence is the most expeditious method known to the world of winning over opponents. And our struggle consists in winning opponents including Englishmen over to our side. We can only do so by being free from ill-will against the weakest or the strongest of them. And this we can only do by being prepared to die for the faith within us and not by killing those who do not see the truth we enunciate.

22nd Nov. 1921

I am,
Your faithful comrade,
M. K. GANDHI.

THE FAST BROKEN

(*November 24, 1921.*)

[Mr. Gandhi broke his fast in the midst of a gathering of co-operators, non-co-operators, Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians and Parsis. There were speeches of goodwill by a representative of each community. The members of the Working Committee were also present. Mr. Gandhi made a statement in Gujarati before breaking his fast. The following is its translation :—]

Friends,

It delights my heart to see Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis and Christians met together in this little assembly. I hope that our frugal fruit repast of this morning will be a sign of our permanent friendship. Though a born optimist, I am not in the habit of building castles in the air. This meeting therefore cannot deceive me. We shall be able to realize the hope of permanent friendship between all communities, only if we who have assembled together will incessantly strive to build it up. I am breaking my fast upon the strength of your assurances. I have not been unmindful of the affection with which innumerable friends have surrounded me during these four days. I shall ever remain grateful to them. Being drawn by them, I am plunging into this stormy ocean out of the haven of peace in which I have been during these few days. I assure you that in spite of the tales of misery that have been poured into my ears, I have enjoyed peace because of a hungry stomach. I know that I cannot enjoy it after breaking the fast. I am too human not be touched by the sorrows of others, and when I find

no remedy for alleviating them, my human nature so agitates me that I pine to embrace death like a long-lost dear friend. Therefore I warn all the friends here that if real peace is not established in Bombay and if disturbances break out again and if as a result they find me driven to a still severer ordeal, they must not be surprised or troubled. If they have any doubt about peace having been established, if each community has still bitterness of feeling and suspicion and if we are all not prepared to forget and forgive past wrongs, I would much rather that they did not press me to break the fast. Such a restraint I would regard as a test of true friendship.

I venture to saddle special responsibility upon Hindus and Mussalmans. The majority of them are non-co-operators. Non-violence is the creed they have accepted for the time being. They have the strength of numbers. They can stand in spite of the opposition of the smaller communities without Government aid. If therefore they will remain friendly and charitable towards the smaller communities, all will be well. I will beseech the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews to bear in mind the new awakening in India. They will see many-coloured waters in the ocean of Hindu and Mussalman humanity. They will see dirty waters on the shore. I would ask them to bear with their Hindu or Mussalman neighbours who may misbehave with them and immediately report to the Hindu and Mussalman leaders through their own leaders with a view to getting justice. Indeed, I am hoping that as a result of the unfortunate discord, a Mahajan will come into being for the disposal of all inter-racial disputes.

The value of this assembly in my opinion consists in

the fact that worshippers of the same one God we are enabled to partake of this harmless repast together in spite of our differences of opinion. We have not assembled with the object to-day of reducing such differences, certainly not of surrendering a single principle we may hold dear, but we have met in order to demonstrate that we can remain true to our principles and yet also remain free from ill-will towards one another.

May God bless our effort.

THE MORAL ISSUE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*November 24, 1921.*)

As soon as we lose the moral basis, we cease to be religious. There is no such thing as religion overriding morality. Man for instance cannot be untruthful, cruel or incontinent and claim to have God on his side. In Bombay the sympathisers of non-co-operation lost the moral balance. They were enraged against the Parsis and the Christians who took part in the welcome to the Prince and sought to 'teach them a lesson'. They invited reprisals and got them. It became after the 17th a game of seesaw in which no one really gained and everybody lost.

Swaraj does not lie that way. India does not want Bolshevism. The people are too peaceful to stand anarchy. They will bow the knee to any one who restores so called order. Let us recognise the Indian psychology. We need not stop to inquire whether such hankering after peace is a virtue or a vice. The average Mussalman of India is

quite different from the average Mussalman of the other parts of the world. His Indian associations have made him more docile than his co-religionists outside India. He will not stand tangible insecurity of life and property for any length of time. The Hindu is proverbially, almost contemptibly, mild. The Parsi and the Christian love peace more than strife. Indeed we have almost made religion subservient to peace. This mentality is at once our weakness and our strength.

Let us nurse the better, the religious part of this mentality of ours. 'Let there be no compulsion in religion'. Is it not religion with us to observe Swadeshi and therefore wear *Khadi*? But if the religion of others does not require them to adopt Swadeshi, we may not compel them. We broke the universal law restated in the Quran. And the law does not mean that there may be compulsion in other matters. The verse means that if it is bad to use compulsion in religion about which we have definite convictions, it is worse to resort to it in matters of less moment.

We can only therefore argue and reason with our opponents. The extreme to which we may go is non-violent non-co-operation with them even as with the Government. But we may not non-co-operate with them in private life, for we do not non-co-operate with the men composing the Government, we are non-co-operating with the system they administer. We decline to render official service to Sir George Lloyd the Governor, we dare not withhold social service from Sir George Lloyd the Englishman.

The mischief, I am sorry to say, began among the Hindus and the Mussalmans themselves. There was social persecution, there was coercion. I must confess that I

did not always condemn it as strongly as I might have. I might have dissociated myself from the movement when it became at all general. We soon mended our ways, we became more tolerant but the subtle coercion was there. I passed it by as I thought it would die a natural death. I saw in Bombay that it had not. It assumed a virulent form on the 17th.

We damaged the Khilafat cause and with it that of the Punjab and Swaraj. We must retrace our steps and scrupulously insure minorities against the least molestation. If the Christian wishes to wear the European hat and unmentionables, he must be free to do so. If a Parsi wishes to stick to his *Fenta* he has every right to do so. If they both see their safety in associating themselves with the Government, we may only wean them from their error by appealing to their reason, not by breaking their heads. The greater the coercion we use, the greater the security we give to the Government, if only because the latter has more effective weapons of coercion than we have. For us to resort to greater coercion than the Government will be to make India more slave than she is now.

Swaraj is freedom for every one, the smallest among us, to do as he likes without any physical interference with his liberty. Non-violent non-co-operation is the method whereby we cultivate the freest public opinion and get it enforced. When there is complete freedom of opinion, that of the majority must prevail. If we are in a minority, we can prove worthy of our religion by remaining true to it in the face of coercion. The Prophet submitted to the coercion of the majority and remained

true to his faith. And when he found himself in a majority he declared to his followers that there should be no compulsion in religion. Let us not again either by verbal or physical violence depart from the injunction, and by our own folly farther put back the hands of the clock of progress.

PART VI

N. C. O. Campaign

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SWORD

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 11, 1920.)

In this age of the rule of brute force, it is almost impossible for any one to believe that any one else could possibly reject the law of the final supremacy of brute force. And so I receive anonymous letters advising me that I must not interfere with the progress of non-cooperation, even though popular violence may break out. Others come to me and assuming that secretly I must be plotting violence, inquire when the happy moment for declaring open violence is to arrive. They assure me that the English will never yield to anything but violence secret or open. Yet others, I am informed, believe that I am the most rascally person living in India, because I never give out my real intention and that they have not a shadow of a doubt that I believe in violence just as much as most people do.

Such being the hold that the doctrine of the sword has on the majority of mankind, and as success of non-cooperation depends principally on absence of violence during its pendency and as my views in this matter, affect the conduct of a large number of people, I am anxious to state them as clearly as possible.

I do believe that, where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Thus when my eldest son asked me what he should have done, had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force which he could and wanted to use, and defended me, I told him that it was his duty to defend me even by using violence. Hence it was that I took part in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu rebellion and the late War. Hence also do I advocate training in arms for those who believe in the method of violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.

But I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. Forgiveness adorns a soldier. But abstinence is forgiveness only when there is the power to punish; it is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature. A mouse hardly forgives a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces by her. I therefore appreciate the sentiment of those who cry out for the condign punishment of General Dyer and his ilk. They would tear him to pieces if they could. But I do not believe India to be helpless. I do not believe myself to be a helpless creature. Only I want to use India's and my strength for a better purpose.

Let me not be misunderstood. Strength does not come from physical capacity. It comes from an indomitable will. An average Zulu is any way more than a match for an average Englishman in bodily capacity. But he

flees from an English boy, because he fears the boy's revolver or those who will use it for him. He fears death and is nerveless in spite of his burly figure. We in India may in a moment realise that one hundred thousand Englishmen need not frighten three hundred million human beings. A definite forgiveness would therefore mean a definite recognition of our strength. With enlightened forgiveness must come a mighty wave of strength in us, which would make it impossible for a Dyer and a Frank Johnson to heap affront upon India's devoted head. It matters little to me that for the moment I do not drive my point home. We feel too down-trodden not to be angry and revengeful. But I must not refrain from saying that India can gain more by waiving the right of punishment. We have better work to do, a better mission to deliver to the world.

I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist. The religion of non-violence is not meant merely for the Rishis and saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law—to the strength of the spirit.

I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self-sacrifice. For, Satyagraha and its off-shoots, non-co-operation and civil resistance, are nothing but new names for the law of suffering. The Rishis, who discovered the law of non-violence in the midst of violence, were greater geniuses than Newton. They were themselves greater warriors than Wellington

Having themselves known the use of arms, they realised their uselessness and taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through non-violence.

Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the putting of one's whole soul against the will of tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul and lay the foundation for that empire's fall or its regeneration.

And so I am not pleading for India to practise non-violence, because it is weak. I want her to practise non-violence being conscious of her strength and power. No training in arms is required for realisation of her strength. We seem to need it, because we seem to think that we are but a lump of flesh. I want India to recognise that she has a soul that cannot perish and that can rise triumphant above every physical weakness and defy the physical combination of a whole world. What is the meaning of Rama, a mere human being, with his host of monkeys, pitting himself against the insolent strength of ten-headed Ravan surrounded in supposed safety by the raging waters on all sides of Lanka? Does it not mean the conquest of physical might by spiritual strength? However, being a practical man, I do not wait till India recognises the practicability of the spiritual life in the political world. India considers herself to be powerless and paralysed before the machine guns, the tanks and the aeroplanes of the English. And she takes up non-cooperation out of her weakness. It must still serve the

same purpose, namely bring her delivery from the crushing weight of British injustice, if a sufficient number of people practise it.

I isolate this non-co-operation from Sinn Feinism, for, it is so conceived as to be incapable of being offered side by side with violence. But I invite even the school of violence to give this peaceful non-co-operation a trial. It will not fail through its inherent weakness. It may fail because of poverty of response. Then will be the time for real danger. The high-souled men, who are unable to suffer national humiliation any longer, will want to vent their wrath. They will take to violence. So far as I know, they must perish without delivering themselves or their country from the wrong. If India takes up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart. I am wedded to India, because I owe my all to her. I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world. She is not to copy Europe blindly. India's acceptance of the doctrine of the sword will be the hour of my trial. I hope I shall not be found wanting. My religion has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself. My life is dedicated to service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism.

Meanwhile, I urge those who distrust me, not to disturb the even working of the struggle that has just commenced, by inciting to violence in the belief that I want violence. I detest secrecy as a sin. Let them give non-violent non-co-operation a trial and they will find that I had no mental reservation whatsoever.

THE GREATEST THING

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 9, 1921.)

It is to be wished that non-co-operationists will clearly recognise that nothing can stop the onward march of the nation as violence. Ireland may gain its freedom by violence. Turkey may regain her lost possessions by violence within a measurable distance of time. But India cannot win her freedom by violence for a century, because her people are not built in the manner of other nations. They have been nurtured in the traditions of suffering. Rightly or wrongly, for good or ill, Islam too has evolved along peaceful lines in India. And I make bold to say that, if the honour of Islam is to be vindicated through its followers in India, it will only be by methods of peaceful, silent, dignified, conscious, and courageous suffering. The more I study that wonderful faith, the more convinced I become that the glory of Islam is due not to the sword but to the sufferings, the renunciation, and the nobility of its early Caliphs. Islam decayed when its followers, mistaking the evil for the good, dangled the sword in the face of man, and lost sight of the godliness, the humility, and austerity of its founder and his disciples. But I am not, at the present moment, concerned with showing that the basis of Islam, as of all religions, is not violence but suffering, not the taking of life but the giving of it.

What I am anxious to show is that non-co-operationists must be true as well to the spirit as to the letter of their vow if they would gain Swaraj within one year. They

may forget non-co-operation but they dare not forget non-violence. Indeed, non-co-operation is non-violence. We are violent when we sustain a government whose creed is violence. It bases itself finally not on right but on might. Its last appeal is not to reason, nor the heart, but to the sword. We are tired of this creed and we have risen against it. Let us not ourselves belie our profession by being violent. Though the English are few, they are organised for violence. Though we are many, we cannot be organised for violence for a long time to come. Violence for us is a gospel of despair.

I have seen a pathetic setter from a god-fearing English woman who defends Dyerism for she thinks that, if General Dyer had not enacted Jallianwala, women and children would have been murdered by us. If we are such brutes as to desire the blood of innocent women and children, we deserve to be blotted out from the face of the earth. There is the other side. It did not strike this good lady that, if we were friends, the price that her countrymen paid at Jallianwala for buying their safety was too great. They gained their safety at the cost of their humanity. General Dyer has been haltingly blamed, and his evil genius Sir Michael O'Dwyer entirely exonerated because Englishmen do not want to leave this country of fiends even if everyone of us has to be killed. If we go mad again as we did at Amritsar, let there be no mistake that a blacker Jallianwalla will be enacted.

Shall we copy Dyerism and O'Dwyerism even whilst we are condemning it? Let not our rock be violence and devilry. Our rock must be non-violence and godliness. Let us, workers, be clear as to what we are about. *Swaraj*

depends upon our ability to control all the forces of violence on our side. Therefore, there is no Swaraj within one year, if there is violence on the part of the people.

We must then refrain from sitting *dhurna*,* we must refrain from crying 'shame, shame' to anybody, we must not use any coercion to persuade our people to adopt our way. We must guarantee to them the same freedom we claim for ourselves. We must not tamper with the masses. It is dangerous to make political use of factory labourers or the peasantry—not that we are not entitled to do so, but we are not ready for it. We have neglected their political (as distinguished from literary) education all these long years. We have not got enough honest, intelligent, reliable, and brave workers to enable us to act upon these countrymen of ours.

NON-VIOLENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1921.)

It is my conviction that we are in sight of the promised land, but the danger is the greatest when victory seems the nearest. No victory worth the name has ever been won without a final effort, more serious than all the preceding ones. God's last test is ever the most difficult. Satan's last temptation is ever the most seductive. We must stand God's last test and resist Satan's last temptation, if we would be free.

* See page 437.

Non-violence is the most vital and integral part of non-co-operation. We may fail in everything else and still continue our battle if we remain non-violent. But we capitulate miserably if we fail in adhering to non-violence. Let it be remembered that violence is the keystone of the Government edifice. Since violence is its sheet-anchor and its final refuge, it has rendered itself almost immune from violence on our side by having prepared itself to frustrate all violent effort by the people. We therefore co-operate with the Government in the most active manner when we resort to violence. Any violence on our part must be a token of our stupidity, ignorance and impotent rage. To exercise restraint under the gravest provocation is the truest mark of soldiership. The veriest tyro in the art of war knows, that he must avoid the ambushes of his adversary. And every provocation is a dangerous ambush into which he must resolutely refuse to walk.

The story of Aligadh is an illustration in point. It seems clear enough that sufficient provocation was given by the police. We have long recognised that it is their business to do so. The people of Aligadh walked into the trap laid for them. They allowed themselves to be provoked, and resorted to arson. It is not yet clear who killed the constable in mufti. The burden is on the people to show that they did not.

Let us be hard on ourselves. If we wish to walk along the straight and narrow path (which is necessarily the shortest), we must not be self-indulgent. We may not throw the blame for any mishap on the *badmashes*. We must be responsible for their acts. Or we declare ourselves

unfit for Swaraj. We must gain control ever over them. Even they must realise the necessity of not interfering with the national and the religious work we are engaged in. In a movement of purification, the whole country is lifted up not excluding the wicked and the fallen. Let there be no mistake, that that is our deliberate claim. If it is merely a lip claim, we shall prove ourselves guilty of having set up a system more satanic than the one we condemn as such.

Therefore whilst we are following the course of non-violent non-co-operation, we are bound in honour to live up to it in thought, word and deed. Let us make the frank confession, if we are too weak or too incredulous to live up to our creed.

The reader must not run away with the idea that I feel we are not standing the test. On the contrary I believe that we have obtained a marvellous hold over the people, that they have understood the necessity of non-violence as they have never done before.

But it would be wrong for us not to take due warning from the slightest deviation from the path deliberately chosen by us.

I find it necessary, too, to utter the word of caution, because the provocation by the Government is on the increase. It is the greatest in the U.P. The arrest of Mr. Sherwani at 5 o'clock in the morning, his swift trial conviction, sentence and removal the same day are enough to irritate the most sober-minded. The details of the trial show that the magistrate knew little of law and cared less. The evidence before him, if all of it has been given to the press, was quite insufficient for a conviction

It almost seems that the conviction and sentence were prearranged. The production of evidence in that case was a huge farce. We are having a rehearsal of trials under the ordinary law. Where is the difference between an executive order and a judicial trial? The latter is more deadly as it is more difficult to expose. To say that a man had no trial, carries greater conviction of injustice than to have to say that the trial was farcical. Repressive laws may be repealed; it does not follow therefore that repression will be done away with. The substance will be the same though the form is changed. What we want is change of substance, of spirit, of heart.

And if we desire that change, we must first change ourselves, *i.e.*, be proof against repression. Just as we may not retort with violence, so may we not weaken under repression no matter how severe or trying it may be.

An authentic rumour comes from the U. P. that at least three more or less noted workers found the gaol life too trying, gave undertakings to refrain from certain acts and procured their discharge. If this is true, it is sad. We must be firm as a rock. There must be no going back. We must be able cheerfully to bear any torture that may be our lot in the gaols of India. We may expect no quarter from the Government. We must expect it to do the worst it can whether within or without the law. Its one purpose is to bend us, since it will not mend itself.

I am not passing harsh judgment on the Government. Dharwad and Aligadh are latest instances of Government's defiance of propriety. If I am to credit another rumour, in a U. P. gaol a brave Musalman prisoner was put in a dark cell

and locked up in it for three days in the midst of foul stench. My informant asked me what a man who could not bear these stench was to do. The harsh but deliberate answer I gave was, that he was even then not to apologise, he was free to dash his hand against the walls of the prison rather than submit to the wish of the tyrant. This is not an idle expression of opinion, but a tit-bit from my South African experiences. The gaol-life in South Africa was not a bed of roses. Many a prisoner had to undergo solitary confinement. Hundreds had to do sanitary work. Several fasted. One woman was discharged a skeleton, because the authorities would not allow her the only food she would eat. But she had a proud and resolute spirit. Out of the thousands who suffered imprisonment in South Africa, with one or two exceptions in the early stages, I do not recall a single instance of a prisoner having weakened and apologised to purchase his freedom. Some like Parsi Rustamji, Imam Kadar Bavazir, Thambi Naidu and many others whose names I could set down, never flinched but repeatedly sought imprisonment. The Temple of Freedom is not erected without the blood of sufferers. Non-violent method is the quickest, the surest and the best. Let us be true to our solemn oath taken at Congress and Khilafat gatherings, and triumph is at hand.

THE NEED FOR HUMILITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 12, 1921.)

The spirit of non-violence necessarily leads to humility. Non-violence means reliance on God, the Rock of ages. If we would seek His aid, we must approach Him with a humble and a contrite heart. Non-co-operationists may not trade upon their amazing success at the Congress. We must act, even as the mango tree which drops as it bears fruit. Its grandeur lies in its majestic lowliness. But one hears of non-co-operationists being insolent and intolerant in their behaviour towards those who differ from them. I know that they will lose all their majesty and glory, if they betray any inflation. Whilst we may not be dissatisfied with the progress made so far, we have little to our credit to make us feel proud. We have to sacrifice much more than we have done to justify pride, much less elation. Thousands, who flocked to the Congress pandal, have undoubtedly given their intellectual assent to the doctrine, but few have followed it out in practice. Leaving aside the pleaders, how many parents have withdrawn their children from schools? How many of those who registered their vote in favour of non-co-operation have taken to hand spinning or discarded the use of all foreign cloth?

Non-co-operation is not a movement of brag, bluster, or bluff. It is a test of our sincerity. It requires solid and silent self-sacrifice. It challenges our honesty and our capacity for national work. It is a movement that

aims and translating ideas into action. And the more we do, the more we find that much more must be *done* than we had expected. And this thought of our imperfection must make us humble.

A Non-co-operationist strives to compel attention and to set an example not by his violence, but by his unobtrusive humility. He allows his solid action to speak for his creed. His strength lies in his reliance upon the correctness of his position. And the conviction of it grows most in his oponent when he least interposes his speech, between his action and his opponent. Speech, especially when it is haughty, betrays want of confidence and it makes one's opponent sceptical about the reality of the act itself. Humility therefore is the key to quick success. I hope that every non-co-operationist will recognise the necessity of being humble and self-restrained.*

* Mr Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of February 9, 1921 —

Abusing the Khaddar—A friend draws attention to the fact that many who have adopted the Khaddar costume are using it as a passport for arrogance, insolence, and, what is worse, fraud. He says that they have neither the spirit of non-co-operation in them nor the spirit of truth. They simply use the Khaddar dress as a cloak for their deceit. All this is likely, especially during the transition stage, whilst khaddar is beginning to become fashionable. I would only suggest to my correspondent that such abuse of Khaddar must not even unconsciously be allowed to be used as an argument against its use. Its use to-day is obligatory on those who believe that there is not sufficient Indian mill-made cloth to supply the wants of the nation, that the wants must be supplied in the quickest way possible by increasing home manufacture, and that such manufacture is possible only by making home-spinning universal. The use of Khaddar represents nothing more than a most practical recognition of the greatest economic necessity of the country. Even a scoundrel may recognise this necessity, and, has therefore a perfect right to wear it. And if a Government spy wore it to deceive people, I would welcome his use of Khaddar as so much economic gain to the country. Only I would not give the

It is because so little is really required to be done and because all of that little depends entirely upon ourselves that I have ventured the belief that Swaraj is attainable in less than one year.

A TRIUMPH OF NON-VIOLENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 17, 1920.)

The *communiqué* issued by the Government of India on the non-co-operation movement may be regarded as its first triumph of a striking order. For the Government have decided *in view of its non-violent character* to refrain, for the time being at any rate, from repressing by violence what they consider to be an unconstitutional movement. The Government, as well as the people, may be congratulated upon this wise decision; and I have not the slightest doubt that, if the movement continues to be purged of all violence whether in deed or in word, it would not only be impossible for the Government to resort to repression, but also to resist the ever growing

wearer of the Khaddar more than his due. And I would therefore not ascribe to him any piety or special virtue.³ It follows, therefore, that co-operationists or government servants may wear Khaddar without incurring the danger of being mistaken for non-co-operationists. We may no more shun Khaddar, that a devout church-goer may renounce his church because bad characters go to it for duping gullible people. I recall the name of an M. P. who successfully cloaked many of his vices by pretending to be a staunch temperance man. Not very long ago a bold and unscrupulous speculator found entry into most respectable circles by becoming a temperance advocate. Well as a poet said that 'hypocrisy is an ode to virtue.'

volume of public opinion against it, when that opinion is backed by well-directed acts of renunciation of Government patronage or support, on a national scale.

But the *communiqué* is careful to hold out the mailed fist, if the leaders of "moderate" opinion fail to check the onward march of non-co-operation. It is interesting to recall the exact wording of the threat. "How long," the *communiqué* ends, "with due regard to their ultimate responsibility for the public safety, the Government will be able to maintain that policy" (*i.e.* non-repression) "will depend largely on the success, which attends the efforts of the moderate citizens to check the extension of the movement and keep its dangers within bounds."

Thus repression is to replace reason and argument, if non-co-operation becomes effective to the extent of making it impossible for the Government to exist whilst refusing to retrace its steps and repent of its crimes against India. For it must be noticed that the danger here feared is evidently not of violence but of the loss of the existence of this Government. If my analysis is correct, the Government are wickedly playing with the 'moderates' and with India. If they mean well, let them make an irrevocable announcement in the clearest possible terms that, so long as the movement remains non-violent, they will not interfere with it, even though it demands, and may result in, complete independence. That they will have to make that announcement sometime or other, I have no doubt, if we, the non-co-operators, are able to keep the movement free from violence. But the announcement made when they are driven to it by irresistible public opinion will have lost all its grace.

The rest of the *communiqué* is quite in keeping with the traditional policy of the Government. It is full of the usual self-adulation and misrepresentations about non-co-operators. It is wrong, for instance, to say that those who have been repressed have been so dealt with for their departure from the principle of non-violence. I challenge the Government to produce from the speeches or writings of those who have been imprisoned any instance of incitement to violence. The language of the defendants has sometimes been reckless, even exaggerated, but the records available to me of the trials of some of them show that there has been no violence preached by the speakers concerned. There is very little that the speakers have said which I would not have said myself. It is equally untrue to say that those who have been punished have been so dealt with for "tampering with the loyalty of the army or of the police," unless a public appeal to recruits, not to sell themselves as mercenary levies for robbing other countries of their independence, amounts to such incitement. The Seditious Meetings Proclamation in the Punjab and the action taken against some non-co-operation papers is an eloquent repudiation of the statement that the Government "have been reluctant to interfere with the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press at a time when India is on the threshold of a great advance towards the realization of the principle of self-government."

The misrepresentation about the leaders of the movement and the cheap sneer at their supposed desire to seek martyrdom is beneath notice. The Government ought to know what a relief it is to the Ali Brothers and myself to

learn that, at least for the present, they do not propose to imprison us. Everybody knows that the danger of an outbreak of violence is the greatest if we are imprisoned. I am aware that this is a humiliating confession. If the people were truly strong and self-reliant, they would remain unperturbed by our or any leaders' imprisonment. So long, however, as the blighting influence of the awe of the Government lasts, so long must there be this fear of an insensate outbreak of violence on the part of the people of this unhappy land, when they are deprived of the assistance and service of those in whom they believe.

The Government's third argument, in favour of the exercise of their self-restraint, is the most specious, and calculated to entrap the unwary. They describe non-co-operation as "a visionary and chimerical scheme, which, if successful, could only result in wide-spread disorder, political chaos, and the ruin of all those who have any real stake in the country. In this one sentence we have the satanic character of the Government. They must know that successful non-co-operation means orderly and peaceful destruction of the present system of the Government, and *its replacement not* by disorder and chaos but by political order of the first magnitude, and protection of every legitimate interest in the country—not excluding that of the European merchant who desires to earn an honest living in India. Mention of the 'real stake' is a wilful insult to the masses of India, and a mischievous incitement to the monied classes to range themselves against the masses. Have the masses no stake in India? Are they not the only people with any real stake in the country? The monied classes, if the worst happened,

could even migrate from the country. The masses know no other home save the few yards of each space which they possess in this land of sorrow and tears.

It lies ill in the mouth of the framers of the resolution to say "that the appeal of non-co-operation is to prejudice and ignorance," when they are aware that from every platform the appeal is made for self-sacrifice, self-purification, and discipline. The misrepresentation of Satyagraha is no less wicked. The experience was indeed bitter during that eventful month of April, but the recollection in the minds of the people of official misdeeds during those days will remain an evergreen. India will never forget how a wicked administrator in the Punjab sought to crush an innocent and pure movement by every means, fair or foul. The wonderful awakening of the people of India to a sense of the wrong then done, and to a sense of their duty, gives the lie direct to the implications of the sentence on Satyagraha.

The resolution in question is an appeal not merely to our ignorance and avarice, but it is an appeal also to our helplessness. For this document proceeds: "The full consummation of their hopes would leave India defenceless alike against foreign aggression and internal chaos, all the benefits of a stable Government and undisturbed peace, the results that have been obtained by the orderly progress of India for more than a century and the still greater results which, it is hoped, will attend her advance under the Reform scheme; her material prosperity and her political progress are all to be sacrificed to the irresponsible caprice of a few misguided men." In my humble opinion, this paragraph is,

indeed, the most mischievous, the most misleading, and, to borrow the phraseology of the Government, "the most immoral." If the argument advanced is sound, India must ever remain in defenceless condition without the British bayonet. I cannot imagine for India a prospect more gloomy, more immoral and more unworthy of a nation, that only a century ago was capable of putting in the field more sturdy warriors than all the soldiers that can be mustered together to-day by any three powers of Europe, barring Russia. What severer condemnation can be pronounced upon the British Government than that, for the commercial greed of the British nation, it has emaculated a whole people? The framers must be aware that the full consummation of our hopes means an India with the whole of her population having one mind, one purpose, self-contained and self-reliant, producing enough for all her daily wants, and therefore well able to stand a blockade by all the naval powers of the world combined. This may all be a day-dream, but that is the exact meaning of 'the full consummation of our hopes'; and I should very much like the Gods to witness a duel between the powers of all the world pouring into India not to punish her for any offence given by her, but in order to trade with her at the point of the bayonet, and the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, the Poorbhias, the Mussalmans, the Rajputs, and all the other military races of India voluntarily fighting for their hearth and home. If I am told that there never will be in India such unity of purpose and mind, I must say that there never will be Swaraj for India and therefore true freedom and true progress, moral and material.' It was Canning who wrote

that under the Indian sky a cloud no bigger than a man's thumb any moment gathers such dimensions as to flood a whole country if it burst. I have implicit faith in the ability of my countrymen to hope that all the bitter experiences of the British Rule, at present lying subconscious in the minds of the nation, may any moment take definite shape in the nation recognizing the necessity of unity and self-sacrifice, such as to compel either repentance and a real change of heart, or withdrawal, on the part of the British Government.

I must refrain from burdening this article with any refutation of the charges of immorality, etc., regarding my advice to the student-world. The pages of this journal have made clear to its readers the ethics of the fundamental position taken upon this question. I must close this lengthy article with noticing the absence of the only thing that can stop the inevitable progress of non-co-operation, *viz.*, a full and satisfactory revision of the Khilafat terms and complete satisfaction about the Punjab. When and if the British nation respects the wishes of India on these two points, co-operation will replace non-co-operation and Swaraj within the Empire will be the most natural consequence.

But till that clear repentance comes, in spite of all the resolution and the repression that may be resorted to by the Government, so far as I can read the national mind, non-violent non-co-operation will and must remain the creed of the nation that has grown weary of camouflage, humbug and honeyed words.

ASSASSINATION OF A DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 1, 1920.)

The assassination of Mr. Willoughby is a most unfortunate event which has naturally evoked public sympathy and indignation. The murder was a cruel, thoughtless and fanatical act. It has not advanced but retarded the cause of Khilafat. Mr. Willoughby had no hand in the Turkish terms. As is quite probable, he was himself a popular officer. It can only be counted as madness to kill an innocent man for a crime committed by a member of his race. And yet the fact must not be disguised that the murder will be regarded by many Mahomedans as a pious act worthy of a martyr. I have heard Mahomedans calmly arguing that such murders are not only justifiable but meritorious. I have known many Hindus who have argued that it was the throwing of bombs which brought about the removal of the Partition of Bengal. I know that many consider Dhingra to have been a martyr. The Sinn Feiners openly practise murder and other forms of violence for the purpose of freeing their country from the English connection. Every assassin or incendiary is considered by them a hero. It is because I feared such a result in our midst, that I advised non-violent non-co-operation regarding the Khilafat. In my opinion, it is the active and open preaching of non-co-operation which has prevented murders and assassinations in the land. The murder of Mr. Willoughby proves that the propaganda of non-violence and non-co-operation has

not proved sufficient to control individual fanatics and that it is not an easy thing to do so. It proves further that the Khilafat wrong is a deep-seated grievance which with the passage of time will sink deeper still instead of being forgotten.

I observe that the *Times of India* credits the Khilafat propaganda with the murder and calls it the 'first fruits.' I realise that the language used is cautious. It connects 'certain aspects of the agitation' with the crime. But I venture to suggest that no aspect of the agitation is responsible for the unfortunate murder. It is the grievous wrong, done by the British ministers, which has evoked the cruel deed.

The *Times of India* is on safer ground when it says that the tragedy 'is a special call to Islam, for all thoughtful Mahomedans must realise that the honour of their religion is at stake.' I wish to emphasise that warning. It must be the special duty of every Khilafat worker to be more careful than hitherto in insisting on complete freedom from violence as the condition precedent to successful non-co-operation. I am sure it is possible to cite texts from the *Koran* in condemnation of murder of innocent men. I can understand violence being done to wrong-doers in order to compel justice. It is unfortunately the chosen method of the civilized world. It has scriptural authority. Islam is said openly to preach violence to the wrong-doer. The so-called votaries of Christianity justify organised warfare for the removal of wrongs, fancied or real. Thousands of Hindus interpret the Gita to be a certificate for war in the cause of justice. It is only a minority (daily growing in numbers) which religiously

believes that violence is wrong in itself and cannot be justified even to vindicate truth. But it cannot (it may be civilised) be religious to murder innocent unarmed men without warning. It is not enough for Khilafat workers to be satisfied with public condemnations (necessary as they are) or for the sake of decorum to join them. It is necessary for us to preach privately, publicly and incessantly the necessity of refraining from violence especially when an active campaign of non-co-operation full of promise is going on. We must feel in every fibre of our own being that every murder, every deed of violence must retard the progress of the movement.

This is an opportunity for distinguishing the Sinn Fein or the Egyptian non-co-operation from ours. The former does not and did not depend for success on non-violence. The Sinn Feiners resort to violence in every shape and form. Theirs is 'frightfulness' not unlike General Dyer's. We may pardon, it if we choose, because we sympathise with their cause. But it does not on that account differ in quality from General Dyer's act. The Central Khilafat Committee has openly and deliberately accepted non-violence for its creed so long as non-co-operation is being carried on. We must therefore seek to guard English life as our own. We must constitute ourselves as self-appointed volunteers guarding English life from violent hands. And our success depends upon our ability to control all the violent and fanatical forces in our midst.

LUCKNOW SPEECHES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1920.)

The recent meeting in Lucknow, held during the visit of the Alī Brothers and myself, has attracted considerable attention and resulted in the secession of Mr. Douglas, an Indian Christian barrister, from the non-co-operation movement. Mr. Douglas' reason for his decision is Maulana Abdul Bari's speech on that occasion. Mr. Douglas charges the Maulana with having called Christians *kafars* and with having practically condoned the late Mr. Willoughby's murder.

Now I was present at the meeting and had reason to listen to every word that Maulana Abdul Bari said with the greatest attention, and I must confess that the speech could not possibly provide any occasion for Mr. Douglas' secession. I deny that the Maulana Saheb either condoned the murder or by calling Mr. Willoughby a *kafar*, had any intention of insulting Christians. Mr. Douglas was hardly justified in seceding. He never protested at the meeting, he never complained to me. He knew that I had great regard for the Maulana Saheb, and that I myself would have spoken out if there was any condonation of the offence in his speech, or if there was any insult meant to be offered to Christians as such. I could not associate myself with an insult to any of the great religions of the world. Moreover Mr. Douglas suspended his practice and joined non-co-operation, not merely for the sake of the Khilafat but equally for the Punjab, and

he was a party to the extension of non-co-operation up to the time of the establishment of Swaraj in India. Does Mr. Douglas now not want Swaraj or redress for the Punjab? And can he abandon the Khilafat movement because a Moulvi however distinguished, gives him offence by his speech? Surely there is something wrong and incomprehensible about Mr. Douglas's attitude. However, I must leave Mr. Douglas to clear up his position and justify his secession on more reasonable grounds.

It is necessary for me to deal with the speeches themselves, and more especially the speech delivered by Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb. The difficulty of a reporter is at any time great, but when he has to take down a report in long hand, and at the same time to translate the speaker's remarks made in a tongue the reporter only half understands, the task becomes still more difficult. Such was the position which my co-worker, Mr. Mahadev Desai, occupied when he took notes of the Maulana's speech. I saw his report after it was published in the *Navajivan* and was grieved about it. I thought that a serious though innocent mistake was made by him. The report does not do justice to the Maulana and makes him say that the murderer of Mr. Willoughby was a martyr, and that he, the Maulana, had accepted my word in preference to that of *Alkoran*. I consider Mr. Mahadev Desai to be one of the best and most careful of the co-workers I have the good fortune to possess. But the best of us may, in spite of the best of intentions, sometimes make mistakes.

To my recollection what Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb said was that he disliked the murder of Mr. Willoughby

as much as anybody. He knew that it had damaged the Khilafat cause. He felt sure that if he had known anything of the proposed murder, he would have himself intervened to prevent it. That was a position he himself could take, and understand when taken by others. But it was a different thing when he was asked, as he was by some of his friends, to condemn the murderer to *Jahannam*. He, as a religious man, found it impossible to do so. He did not know how the murder was committed, or what were the motives actuating it. The murderer's position after death was therefore clearly a matter between him and his Maker, and it would be presumption on the part of any person to anticipate the verdict of the Deity. Mr. Willoughby belonged to the *kafar* race, and had there been *Jehad* proclaimed, anyone belonging to the enemy race could have been lawfully killed by the sword of Islam. But they (the Mussalmans) had decided not to draw the sword and so it was not lawful for any Mussalman to take the life of any member of the enemy race. They had accepted Mr. Gandhi's advice of non-co-operation. For there was ample warrant for it in the Koran and the Prophet's own life. And so long as non-co-operation continued, he would be beguiled entirely by Mr. Gandhi. He was rebuked for making friends with the Hindus who were idolators. It was his conviction that it was perfectly competent for a Mussalman to prefer friendship with the Hindus, and even to refrain from killing cows, to friendship with those *kafars* who had left no stone unturned to put Islam in jeopardy.

This is the gist of the Maulana's speech. The speech was certainly bitter. Who can complain of bitterness of

speech in a man of such religious devotion as Maulana Abdul Bari when he finds that his religious honour is at stake? I personally dislike the use of the word *kafar* as applied to anyone, as I dislike the use by a Hindu of the word *Mlechha* or *Anarya* to any one. But I refuse to quarrel with the Mussalman or the Hindu for the use of words to which they have been accustomed from their childhood. Time will certainly tend towards the discontinuance of such words as friendship between people of different professions and faiths grows. Must I refuse to acknowledge the learning or the goodness of a man like Bishop Heber for calling Hindus heathens and even pitying them? "Man alone is vile," was said of a whole race of mankind and is even to-day sung in many a Christian church. I can therefore see no warrant for Mr. Douglas' decision in the above speech.

Maulana Shaukat Ali was still more unexceptionable. He said no one could regret more than he did the murder of Mr. Willoughby. Had not Khilafat Committees sedulously tried their best to prevent violence, there would certainly have been not one but many such murders. But it was their duty for the sake of their own religion and honour to prevent them so long as they accepted non-cooperation. But he declined to identify himself with toadying resolutions regarding the murderer.

I observe too that I have been misreported. I never said that we would give notice when we intended to draw the sword. I condemned the murder with the emphasis I could command and said that the honour of Islam would be injured if there was any condonation of the murder of an innocent man when an assurance of

safety was issued by authoritative religious bodies in Islam. I said further that my own personal religion forbade me to take the life of my enemy in any case whatsoever. But I added that I recognised that Islam, and for that matter, lacs of Hindus, believed that killing one's enemy was considered lawful under certain circumstances. And I said that when the Mussalmans of India wanted to draw the sword, they would as honourable men declare themselves in no equivocal terms and give due notice.

And I repeat what I have often said that the noblest and the most fearless among the Mussalmans (and I count Maulana Bari Saheb and the Ali brothers as such) are trying their utmost to prevent violence. I verily believe that but for strenuous efforts of such men, violence would have broken out in this land. I admit that it would have done no good to Islam or India. It would only have provided occasion for ruthless repression without doing any honour to Islam or India.

THE SIKH LEAGUE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*November 17, 1920.*)

Babu Kalinath Roy, the talented editor of the *Tribune*, has kindly sent me an extract from a press letter received by him from a Sikh correspondent, for my comments. The extract runs as follows: "Mahatma Gandhi told some of the Sikh gentlemen who went to remonstrate with him on the 21st October last on the pernicious effects of his propaganda on Sikh masses, that his pro-

paganda of non-co-operation was non-violent, that there were no doubt visible signs that the movement was likely to become violent among the Sikhs, that he would strongly urge the Sikhs to remain non-violent both in word and deed ; but that if despite his warning the Sikhs become violent, he shall not regret if the British authorities crushed them by force. He shall then let them be annihilated without letting either Hindus or Mahomedans come to their help, for it shall be by the sacrifice (*ahuti*) and total extinction of an element which is likely to become violent that the propaganda of non-violent non-co-operation will succeed." Babu Kalnath Roy, after quoting the foregoing, says. "The writer adds that at a meeting of the Sikh League these words were duly repeated as having been used by you and that you, who was present, did not contradict the report." The letter has, I am further informed, been published by the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore

The above remarks are, I suppose, intended to discredit me. Now the conversation referred to was long, lasting nearly an hour. Some of the remarks made by me during the conversation have been torn from their setting and put together as though I had made them in the manner and the order given. The fact is that the conversation was carried on partly in Hindustani and partly in English. My remarks were addressed to several members of the deputation. The latter had come to urge me not to put the idea of non-co-operation before the Sikhs, especially as I had myself witnessed the violent attitude of some members of the League. I told them in the course of my replies to several questioners that I did not like the

attitude of some of the Sikhs present at the meeting, and that it filled me with grief. I told them also that, if I was permitted to speak, I would warn the audience against the danger of violence, that it would be suicidal to do violence to co-operators and seek to make them non-co-operators by compulsion. I told them too that the non-co-operators would be courting destruction if they committed violence, for the British would in that event have an opportunity of destroying the whole of the community. I certainly told my hearers that, so far as I could, I would dissuade both Hindus and Mahomedans from helping any campaign of violence, and that I would not, in this struggle against the Government, be deterred by the fear of such a calamity as has been described to me.

The summary of my remarks given by the writer thus hardly does justice to me. I may state that I do not know the writer nor have I seen the letter from which Babu Kalinath Roy has taken the extract. I do recollect a speaker at the Sikh League reproducing the conversation. His speech was in Gurumukhi, and in so far as I understood him, I think he correctly represented the gist of my remarks.

NECESSITY OF DISCIPLINE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October* 20, 1920.)

I have already remarked upon my experiences of want of method and discipline in Madras. The same want is

being noticed during the tour in the Rohelkhund. Everywhere there is chaos and disorder not for want of men but because of volunteers without training. They are called upon to handle a situation and crowds that are unprecedented. There is more noise and bustle than work.

Maulana Shaukat Ali is the indefatigable organiser. He wants to satisfy all parties and therefore packs too many events in any programme he arranges. To take only one instance. He accepted for one single day a motor ride from Aligarh to Hathras, thence to Etah and from Etah to Kasgunj with the prospect of a slow night journey from Kasgunj to Cawnpore. The motor ride covered a distance of 90 miles. After a trying meeting of workers at Aligarh early in the morning, we got into our motors at 9-45 A. M., and reached Hathras at about 11 A. M. The sun was burning hot and fierce. The inevitable noisy procession was there. It was followed by a huge meeting involving an intolerable strain on the voice of the strongest speaker. We however got for our pains resignation of three honorary magistracies. We motored thence to Etah. There was a little more order there than at Hathras. Soon after finishing Etah we motored to Kasgunj. We had accidents during the journey, the cars refusing to move. With difficulty we reached Kasgunj, Maulana Shaukat Ali and his companions not reaching in time for the train. We had several resignations at Etah. The meeting at Kasgunj for its enormous size was well managed but not without difficulty. Touching the feet has become an uncontrollable performance causing much waste of time and involving danger when it is resorted to in the midst of a large crowd.

But the most wretched experience was the night journey from Kasgunj to Cawnpore. It was made most uncomfortable by crowds attending at every station. They were everywhere insistent and assertive. The noises they made in order to wake me up were piercing and heart-rending. I was tired. My head was reeling and was badly in want of rest. In vain did Mrs. Gandhi and others plead with the crowds for self-control and silence. The more they implored, the more aggressive the crowds became. It was a tug of war between her and the crowds. The latter would put on the light as often as she put it off. If she put up the shutters, the crowd immediately put them down. I was resting, did they want me to die a premature death? The answer was they had come many miles to have *darshan*, and *darshan* they must have. I had hardened my heart and refused to move till it was day-break. But there was not a wink of sleep for any of us during the whole of that night. It was a unique demonstration of love run mad. An expectant and believing people groaning under misery and insult believe that I have a message of hope for them. They come from all quarters within walking reach to meet me.

As I do believe that I have a message of hope and certain deliverance but—?)

Yes. It is a big B U T. There is no deliverance and no hope without sacrifice, discipline and self-control. Mere sacrifice without discipline will be unavailing. How to evolve discipline out of this habitual indiscipline? Not certainly by the British bayonet or the British hypocrisy. The British officials have no affection for this loving and phenomenal demonstration of a peaceful and peace-loving

people. They would put it down, if they could, by barbarous exhibition of force even as Sir Michael O'Dwyer tried and ingloriously failed.

But if this demonstration cannot be put down by force, it cannot also procure *Swaraj* for India unless regulated and harnessed for national good. There are in it all the elements of success as well as of self destruction. It cannot lead to the promised goal if the nation in extravagant affection wastes its servants by encroaching upon their hours of needed rest. We must therefore cease to hold nocturnal demonstrations. We must have consideration for the feelings of the lowest of our fellow-beings. We must not disturb the rest of a train load of passengers.

✓ We must learn to transmute our love of our heroes into unquenchable energy and useful action. Love that is satisfied with touching the feet of its hero and making noise at him is likely to become parasitical. Such love ceases to be a virtue and after a time becomes a positive indulgence and therefore a vice. The greatest task before the nation to-day is to discipline its demonstrations if they are to serve any useful purpose. Non-co-operation is not designed to create hatred but to purify the nation to the point of rendering it proof against injurious aggression whether from within or from without. Non-co-operation to be effective must be prevented by co-operation between all the units composing this great and ancient people. Let us begin by co-operating with our loved ones.

OUR LATE TOUR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 27, 1920.)

My experiences are becoming so much enriched by every tour that it is difficult for me to cope with them and give the results to the reader. I must therefore content myself with adding to the stock on the necessity of discipline and organisation. I have dealt with our experiences up to the journey to Cawnpore. I was dreading our approach to Cawnpore—the Cawnpore of Maulana Hasrat Mohani and Dr. Murarilal. They are both great workers. The arrangements at the station were perfect. A large crowd awaited us at the station. But the discipline observed was so good that we were able to make our way through two solid rows of men without a single member moving before we had taken our seats in the cars. What might have meant a waste of thirty minutes was finished within five. The procession was happily abandoned. The programme was as business-like as the reception at the station. We reached at about 8 o'clock. We had only a day at our disposal, but during that time there was a meeting with the workers, a private interview with Mr. Frazeir Hunt of the *Chicago Tribune*, a visit to the Widows' Home, opening of a national Gujarati School, a meeting of the Gujarati ladies (a crowded ladies meeting), opening of a national arbitration court, an open-air meeting, and finally private chats with visitors. All this was finished without any undue rush and strain. There was at first a little confusion at the open air

meeting. It was discovered that no previous instructions were given to the volunteers. But after a little effort, there too perfect silence reigned, and the audience listened to three heavy speeches amid perfect silence. It is my conviction that as soon as we have organised and disciplined ourselves, *Swaraj* will be established. An organised refusal to be ruled by any foreign power is all that is needed in a country like ours. Lucknow was a contrast. There was utter confusion at the station and a seething mass of humanity. It was a demonstration of undisciplined love. All were pressing forward to get at us. Not one of them realised that it was an impossible task. At last I refused to move unless the crowd had regained self-control. In a few minutes the crowd understood what I had to say, and made way for us. There was a trying procession. We were all privileged to stay with Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb. He had engaged a Brahmin cook and made special arrangements for the Hindus of the party. The reader may recall that it was here that Maulana Zafar-ul-Mulk, a cultured Mussalman of blameless character, was arrested. It was not far from Lucknow that Mr. Willoughby* was murdered. There was at night a vast meeting. The crowd listened with wrapt attention. I wish I had time and space to give the gist of the speeches. We all referred to the Kheri murder and showed how it had taken place in spite of the vigilance of the Khilafat Committee, and how it had injured the cause of the Khilafat by creating unnecessary alarm and covering the local committee with suspicion. I am sorry to have to note that the leaders

* See page 731.

were conspicuous by their absence. They think that the movement of non-co operation is harmful. Time alone will show. We must be patient with them. They belong to the nation and will march with it as soon as their distrust is dispelled.

I must reluctantly omit the stirring events of Amritsar and Lahore and hasten to Bhiwani. At Amritsar there was a huge but unorganised crowd at the station. We evaded it by alighting at another platform. The demonstration at Lahore we evaded by motoring there.

The night journey to Bhiwani was perfectly restless. Crowds insisted on *darshan*. One man suggested that Mahatmas needed no rest and that it was their duty to give *darshan*. Some were really angry that we all stolidly refused to move out of our beds. Another remarked that we must be highly inconsiderate not to respect the wishes of the people and get up to give *darshan*. At length tired and sleepless we reached Bhiwani. Probably fifty thousand people had gathered from surrounding villages. I was therefore afraid that we would be crushed to atoms. But to my agreeable surprise, I found perfect order there. There was no rush or noisy bustle at the station. All kept their respective places. The procession was comfortably managed in spite of a dense throng. Order observed at the Pandal was still more striking. It was a huge artistic but non-pretentious structure. There was not a single chair—not even for the President. Distinguished visitors were seated on a substantial and commodious platform erected in the midst of the Pandal. Although there was accommodation for 12,000 people, the Pandal appeared to be roomy. The approaches were wide. The

ground was excavated to slope towards the centre. All therefore had a perfect view of the centre. The only suggestion I have to make is that a semi-circle is a better arrangement. There should be no seats at the back of the platform.

Let Bhiwani and Hyderabad (Sindh) present a lesson to the approaching Congress. The Reception Committee will save a few thousand rupees and much space if they will dispense with chairs whether on the platform or below. We must cater more and more for the masses and their leaders. We, the educated few, hope to control them only through the leaders of the masses who are as simple as the masses themselves. It is cruel to impose chairs on the many, because the few seem to want them. I hope too, that the Nagpur volunteers will be trained from now for their respective duties so that we may have perfect arrangements regarding every little detail.

HOOLIGANISM

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 1, 1920.)

The columns of *Young India* are open to all who have any grievance against non-co-operators. "One who knows" has sent to the editor a letter which I gladly publish.* He has, in a covering letter giving his name,

* The following is the letter referred to :—

The disturbance created by a mob of young men at the time of Mrs. Besant's lectures in Bombay reminds me of another caused in Dharwar a short time ago, which goes to prove how the principle of non-co-opera-

pleaded for the publication of his letter. Such pleading was unnecessary in connection with a matter of public importance. If the facts related by the correspondent are true, they reflect no credit on the young men of Dharwad. The correspondent has connected the incident with non-co-operation. It is the fashion nowadays to connect every incident of indecent behaviour with non-

tion, which is at present on the lips of every person, has not at all been understood even by Mr. Gandhi's followers. A kind-hearted European lady, Miss T. L. M'Cafee by name, who is well-known in Dharwar and the Kanarese districts of the S. D. as a very sympathetic and charitable woman silently spending a lot of her money on poor Indian boys and girls for their education, had a very awful time and experience on the occasion of an entertainment she gave for the purpose of collecting funds in aid of the children's Guild of Service, of which she is one of the Vice-Presidents, Her Excellency Lady Lloyd being the President. The object of the entertainment in question was to provide for a permanent bed for a sick Indian child in the Civil Hospital of Dharwar and Mrs. Covernton was presiding on the occasion. A drama was intended to be performed by school girls but was dropped in the nick of time at the desire of the guardians. So a programme of Indian Music, and singing and recitations by girls, who were allowed by their guardians, was hastily arranged, but it is a matter for shame and sorrow that no sooner did the proceedings commence than a mob of young men, who had gathered outside the hall, acting under the advice of the non-co-operationists of the place, began throwing stones at the guests and glass windows, and kept on hooting and shouting and creating a serious disturbance. When the proceedings ended and the guests were going home, they were pelted with stones. European guests were particularly insulted and some women teachers were also hit with stones. Miss M'Cafee had to leave the hall under the escort of her servants and had even to run the risk of being exposed to all sorts of insults. However we must be thankful that she escaped unscathed which must be considered a providential escape. She underwent all this trouble and risk for the good of the people in whom she took an abiding interest but who treated her in return in such a disgraceful and cowardly manner. It is really disgusting to find that not a single Indian gentleman came to the help of the kind-hearted lady except a solitary merchant, and that no non-

co-operation. I wish that the incident had been brought to my notice when I was at Dharwad. I would then have been able to investigate the matter and dealt with it then. I may state that stones were thrown at a meeting of Dharwad students that was held by me in the open. One boy narrowly escaped being seriously hurt. And it was a pleasure to watch the audience remaining unmoved in spite of the stone throwing. I was told too that stone throwing at meetings was not an unusual occurrence at Dharwad in connection with the non-Brahmin movement. I state this fact only to show that Dharwad enjoys the unenviable reputation for stone throwing in a special manner. I must therefore decline to connect the incident either with non-co-operation or with any anti-European movement. Though the correspondent's letter is obscure on the point, it is evident from what he says that resentment was felt at the idea of girls taking part in a drama. The correspondent says that the drama was dropped 'in the nick of time at the desire of the guardians.' There must have been persistence to provoke resentment.

But my position is clear. No amount of provocation could possibly justify the hooliganism of the 'mob of

co-operationist of Dharwar considered it to be his duty to silence the rowdy students and induce them to preserve order and peace at a time when the lives of women and children were in danger. Actions, such as these, done in the name of non-co-operation are sure to land us into disaster. The principle that no movement, however just, can hope to succeed by a resort to violence has not been grasped even by educated elderly people, much less by young boisterous boys of impressionable age. All this is not a good sign of the future of our country, and every patriot must hang down his head in shame at demonstrations of rowdiness of this nature.

Yours &c. 'One who knows.'

young men'. They had no right to prevent the performance that was at last determined upon, if the guardians of the girls did not mind it. The truest test of democracy is in the ability of anyone to act as he likes, so long as he does not injure the life or property of anyone else. It is impossible to control public morals by hooliganism. Public opinion alone can keep a society pure and healthy. If the young men of Dharwad did not like a public exhibition of Dharwad girls on the stage, they should have held public meetings and otherwise enlisted public opinion in their favour. The movement of non-co-operation is intended to check all such abuses. Non-co-operationists are undoubtedly expected, not only to refrain from taking part in such violent scenes as are represented to have taken place at Dharwad, but they are expected also to prevent them on the part of others. The success of non-co-operation depends upon the ability of non-co-operationists to control all forces of violence * All may not take

* Mr. Gandhi writes in *Young India* of February 23, 1921 —

Rowdyism —Certainly, non-co-operation has received a rude shock by disgraceful behaviour at the Bombay and Poona meetings towards Messrs. Shastri and Paranjpye. I have seen the explanation that the hooliganism was resorted to, not by non-co-operation students but by those who wanted to discredit the movement itself, and to rouse prejudice against non-co-operation students. The explanation is likely to be partly true for there are undoubtedly men who would for the sake of killing the movement even create violence. For non-co-operation to be speedily successful, we must be able to provide even against such contingencies. A soldier cannot plead difficulties in defence of his defeat. When General Buller failed to relieve Ladysmith he was superseded. When Lord Roberts failed to finish the South African War, Lord Kitchener took over command. This Government will live on only so long as it can circumvent non-co-operation. If non-co-operation students did not want to be discredited, why did they attend the meeting either in Bombay or in Poona? The

part in the programme of self-sacrifice but all must recognise the necessity of non-violence in word or deed.

I am surprised that the correspondent in his covering letter speaks of the hooliganism at Dharwad in the same breath as the massacre of Jallianwala Bagh. He loses all sense of proportion when he compares the cold-blooded and calculated butchery of innocent men, who had given no provocation, with the undisciplined and thoughtless demonstration of a 'mob of young men,' who were labouring under a fancied or real wrong. Both acts are worthy of condemnation. But there is as much difference between the programme of the Dharwad boys and the Dyerism at Amritsar as there is between an attempt at simple hurt and a completed murder.

notice clearly stated that only those who wished to hear the other side of the question were to attend. There was, therefore, no excuse for the scenes that were enacted in Bombay and Poona. Moreover, it is often forgotten that Messrs. Shastri and Paranjpye are among the ablest and the most public spirited men we have in the country. They are as much lovers of their country as non-co-operators themselves. We may consider them to be mistaken in their view as they consider us to be mistaken. But we shall grievously err if we refuse to listen to the arguments of our opponents.'

Nor need we seek to justify rowdyism on the strength of English precedents. We may not call the movement religious and continue still to copy the bluster and violence of English meetings. Our strength lies in not copying foreign or other precedents without discrimination. This movement if it is to be non-violent in essence, as it must be to be successful, has to retain its distinctive character at every step and at all times.

DIFFICULTIES IN OUR WAY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*November 10, 1920.*)

Our difficulties are of two kinds ; those that are imposed from without and those that are of our own creation. The latter are far more dangerous, because we often hug them and are therefore reluctant to remove them. Thus, for instance, the disturbances created at Mrs. Beasant's recent meetings at Bombay were of our own making. And it is easier to deal with a seditious meetings proclamation than the disturbance at Mrs. Besant's meetings. A prohibition of 'seditious' meetings gives us strength. Disturbances created by us undoubtedly weaken our cause. The verbal rowdyism at Mrs. Besant's meeting was a type of violence. It was a distinct departure from the creed of non-violent non-co-operation. It may easily result in physical violence.

Those who created the disturbances ought to realise its seriousness for the sacred cause they have at heart. It is the very worst training we can give ourselves in Swaraj. ⁴ Swaraj presupposes mutual toleration of views, no matter how distasteful they may be to us. If the non-co-operationists refuse to listen to the other party's views, they lay themselves open to the same charge as the Government, which they complain comes to decisions without considering their viewpoint. Non-co-operation against the Government is based on, and is possible with, co-operation among ourselves. We must bring about, as far as possible and consistently with our creed, harmony among our-

selves. Rowdyism is hardly the way to do so. By their action at the meetings in question non-co-operationists have still further estranged from themselves Mrs. Besant and her friends and followers. The loss is patent enough. They have certainly gained no new adherents by their rowdyism. In so far as the students were concerned in the insult offered to Mrs. Besant, they have discredited themselves at a critical period in their evolution. They are called upon, in the name of religion and country, to disregard the wishes even of their parents, should they dissuade them from leaving schools tainted with Government grant or affiliation. Such disregard is permissible only to sons and daughters who have cultivated the sense of scrupulous respect and obedience towards their parents and elders. 'That disobedience is a virtue only when it is resorted to in response to a higher call and has not a trace of bitterness, hostility, or resentment in it. It is a positive vice when it becomes thoughtless, insolent, and rowdy.' The one ennobles, the other degrades. And after all, do we not owe anything to Mrs. Besant's years, her past brilliant services, and her sex? The rising generation will commit suicide if it becomes ungrateful. India's gratefulness ought to ensure for Mrs. Besant a respectful hearing even when she opposes India's sentiment. She does so from pure motives. She thinks that we are in error, she is of opinion that we are retarding India's progress. Surely it is her duty to wean us from what she considers is our error. And it is our duty respectfully to consider what she says.

But I have been told that unless, at her meetings, an emphatic dissent is expressed, she would make capital of

our supposed silence, and claim that there is a larger body of Indian opinion at her back than is really the case. Surely rowdyism is not the only way of expressing dissent. The best and the chosen way would be not to attend her meetings, unless we wish to go in order to be convinced. We need not swell her audience when we know that we do not approve of her views. The other way, if we must attend, is to enter our respectful dissent at the end of the meeting, or if we consider her remarks to be offensive to express our dissent by courteously walking out. A noisy demonstration is a sign of our weakness. A dignified withdrawal is a proof of our strength. Rowdyism is, as a rule, intended to cover a minority that wishes to break up a meeting. A majority conscious of its strength produces an eloquent and electrical effect both on the speaker and his, or her, minority of followers.

It is true that this rowdyism is not a result of the movement of non co-operation. It is a legacy of our past. We have been, to our harm, nurtured in the baneful traditions of the West in the manner of conducting our meetings. Applause and shouts of dissent are essentially a Western institution. With the, for us, new method of *non-violent non-co-operation*, the old must go. * The

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of March 16, 1921 —

Writing of the means brings me to the recent happenings in Benares. The attack on Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya is symptomatic of the temper of the people. If any man in India should be free from insult it is Punditji. His services to the Punjab are still fresh in our memory. After all, his labour alone has brought into being that great University in Benares. His patriotism is second to no one's. He is gentle to a fault. It is India's misfortune, not his fault, that he does not see his way clear to risk the temporary giving up of his idol. That he should have been insulted in the manner reported is a matter of deep sorrow. If the

two cannot co-exist. If we are engaged in a duel between religion and irreligion, and if we truly represent the forces of religion, we shall have to give up even verbal violence and learn dignified ways of dealing with our opponents. It is through training in cool courage and self-sacrifice, discipline and faith in God, and therefore

Sanskrit students or the so-called Sanyasis chose to block the passage of the students, Punditji certainly had the right,—it was his duty,—to intervene and secure a free passage for co-operating students. In my opinion, the police were perfectly justified in prosecuting the ringleaders or those whom they believed to be such. That those arrested were roughly handled I can well believe. But we may not expect gentleness from the police even when we have attained Swaraj. I am, therefore, unable to extend any sympathy to those who so manifestly discredited a cause which they ignorantly claimed to represent.

It is one thing, however, to condemn the excesses in the movement and another to condemn the movement itself. It is necessary to distinguish between the true non-co-operators and the false ones. The behaviour of the immature students and the ignorant Sanyasis was undoubtedly disgraceful and worthy of condemnation. But the vast body of the people know the limits of non-co-operation and do not travel beyond them. I venture to claim that India has never been so tranquil as she is to-day, and yet it is not the inertia of the weak and the unknowing, but it is the enlightened quiet of those who are conscious of their daily growing strength. India knows the malady from which she is suffering and is preparing to throw it off by a course of inward purification.

At the same time we have to take care of what we say and do. Some of the best men of India are standing aloof because they have no faith in the people remaining non-violent in the face of provocation. And every little act, even of discourtesy, on the part of non-co-operators retards the fulfilment of our purpose. We cannot be wise, temperate, and furious in a moment, we are either violent or non-violent. We must lie in the bed we have made for ourselves. Having decided to pin our faith to non-violence, we may not coquet with violence. We would therefore warn ourselves against countenancing violence in any shape or form. If we do not build our movement on the solid rock of non-violence, it may any day tumble, like a pack of cards, with a whiff. We cannot serve God and Mammon.

humility to the uttermost, that we shall conserve the honour of Islam and our country, and turn our opponents into admirers and fellow-workers.

IF I AM ARRESTED *

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 10, 1920.)

I have been constantly thinking of what the people would do in case I am arrested. My co-workers also have been putting this question to me. What would be the plight of India if the people took to the wrong path through love run mad? What would be my own plight in such a case?

Rivers of blood shed by the Government cannot frighten me; but I would be deeply pained even if the people did so much as abuse the Government for my sake or in my name. It would be disgracing me if the people lost their equilibrium on my arrest. The nation can achieve no progress merely by depending upon me. Progress is possible only by their understanding and following the path suggested by me. For this reason, I desire that the people should maintain perfect self-control and consider the day of my arrest as a day of rejoicing. I desire that even the weaknesses existing to-day should disappear at that time.

What can be the motive of the Government in arresting me? The Government are not my enemy, for I have not a grain of enmity towards them. But they believe that I am the soul of all this agitation, that, if I

* Translated from Mr. Gandhi's article in *Navjivan*.

am removed, the ruled and the rulers would be left in peace, that the people are blindly following me. Not only the Government but some of our leaders also share this belief. How, then, can the Government put the people to the test? How can the Government ascertain whether the people understand my advice or are simply dazzled by my utterances? The only way left to them is to arrest me. Of course, there still remains an alternative for them and that lies in the removal of the causes which have led me to offer this advice. But intoxicated as they are with power, the Government will not see their own fault and even if they do, they will not admit it. The only way then that remains for them is to measure the strength of the people. They can do this by arresting me. 'If the people are thus terrorised into submission, they can be said to deserve the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs.'

'If on the other hand the people resort to violence, they will merely be playing into the hands of the Government. Their aeroplanes will then bomb the people, their Dyers will shoot into them, and their Smiths will uncover the veils of our women. There will be other officers to make the people rub their noses against the ground, crawl on their bellies, and undergo the scourge of whipping. Both these results will be equally bad and unfortunate. They will not lead to *Swaraj*. In other countries governments have been overthrown by sheer brute-force, but I have often shown that India cannot attain *Swaraj* by that force. What, then, should the people do if I am arrested? The answer now is simple. The people

(1) should preserve peace and calmness,

(2) should not observe *Hartals*,

(3) should not hold meetings,

but

(4) should be fully awake.

I should certainly expect—

(5) all the Government schools to be vacated and shut down,

(6) Lawyers to withdraw from practice, in greater numbers.

(7) Settlement by private arbitration of cases pending before the Law Courts.

(8) Opening of numerous national schools and colleges.

(9) Renunciation of all foreign cloth in favour of the exclusive use of hand spun and hand woven garments by lacs of men and women, and selling or burning of any foreign cloth in stock.

(10) None to enlist in the army or in any other Government service.

(11) Those able to earn their livelihood by other means to give up Government services, civil and even military.

(12) Contribution of as much as is wanted towards national funds.

(13) Title holders to surrender titles in greater numbers.

(14) Candidates to withdraw from elections, or if already elected to resign their seats.

(15) Voters who have not yet made up their minds, to resolve that it is sin to send any representative to the Councils.

If the people resolve and carry this out, they would not have to wait for *Swaraj* even for a year. If they can exhibit this much strength, we shall have attained *Swaraj*.

I shall then be set free under the nation's seal. That will please me. My freedom to-day is, like a prison to me.

It will only prove the people's incompetence if they use violence to release me, and then depend upon my help to attain *Swaraj* for them. Neither I nor anyone else can get *Swaraj* for the nation. It will be got on the nation proving its own fitness.

In conclusion it is useless to find fault with the Government. We get what government we deserve. When we improve, the government also is bound to improve. Only when we improve, can we attain *Swaraj*. Non-co-operation is the nation's determination to improve. Will the nation abandon the resolve and begin to co-operate after my arrest? If the people become mad and take to violence and as a result of it crawl on their bellies, rub their noses on the ground, salute the Union Jack and walk eighteen miles to do it, what else is that but co-operation? It is better to die than to submit to crawling &c. In fine, consider it from any point of view, the course suggested by me is the right one for the people to take.

DEMOCRACY vs. MOBOCRACY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*September 8, 1920.*)

Looking at the surface there is but a thin dividing line between mob-law and the people's law. And yet the division is complete and will persist for all time.

India is to-day quickly passing through the mob law stage. The use of the adverb signifies my hope. It may be our misfortune to have to pass through that process even in slow stages. But it is wisdom to adopt every means at our disposal to have done with that stage as quickly as possible.

There is much tendency on our part to yield to the rule of the mob. There was mob rule at Amritsar on the 10th April, 1919. There was mob rule at Ahmedabad on the same fateful day. It represented undisciplined destruction and therefore it was thoughtless, profitless, wicked and harmful. War is disciplined destruction, much more bloody than any yet committed by mobs. And yet war has been apostrophised, because we have been decieved by the temporary but brilliant results achieved by some wars. So, if India has to achieve her freedom by violence, it will have to be by disciplined and honourable (in so far as it is possible to associate honour with violence) violence, named war. It will then be an act not of mobocracy but democracy.

But my purpose to-day is not to write of mobocracy of the Ahmedabad type. I intend to deal with the type with which I am more familiar. The Congress is a demonstration for the mob and in that sense and that only. Though organised by thoughtful men and women, it may be called a mob-demonstration. Our popular demonstrations are unquestionably mob-demonstrations. During the memorable tour of the Khilafat mission through the Punjab, Sindh and Madras, I have had a surfeit of such demonstrations. I have been ashamed to witness, at railway stations, thoughtless though

unwitting destruction of passengers' luggage by demonstrators who in their adoration of their heroes have ignored everything else and everybody else. They have made, much to the discomfort of their heroes, unmusical and harsh noises. They have trampled upon one another. They have elbowed out one another. All have shouted, all at the same time, in the holy name of order and peace. Ten volunteers have been heard to give the same order at the same time. Volunteers often become demonstrators instead of remaining people's policemen. It is a task often dangerous, always uncomfortable, for the heroes to be escorted through a broken chain of volunteers from the platform to the coach intended for them. Often it is a process which, although it should occupy no more than five minutes, has occupied one hour. The crowd instead of pressing back presses towards the heroes and who therefore requires to be protected. The coach is taken possession of by anybody who dares, volunteers being the greatest sinners. The heroes and other lawful occupants have to reason with the intruders that they may not mount the foot-boards in that summary fashion. The hood of the coach is roughly handled by the processionists. It is not often that I have seen hoods of motors left undamaged by crowds. On the route instead of crowds lining the streets, they follow the coach. The result is confusion worse confounded. Every moment there is danger of accidents. That there is rarely any accident at such demonstrations is not due to the skill of the organisers, but the crowd is determined to put up with all jostling and retain its perfect good humour. In spite of everyone jostling every-

one else, one has the slightest *wish* to inconvenience one's neighbour. To finish the picture, there is the meeting, an ever-growing cause of anxiety. You face nothing but disorder, din, pressing, yelling and shouting there. A good speaker arrests the attention of the audience and there is order such that you can hear a pin drop.

All the same this is mobocracy. You are at the mercy of the mob. So long as there is sympathy between you and the mob, everything goes well. Immediately that cord is broken, there is horror. An Ahmedabad episode now and then gives you the mob psychology.

We must then evolve order out of chaos. And I have no doubt that the best and the speediest method is to introduce the people's law instead of mob law.*

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of July 13, 1921:—

The news from Aligarh is disquieting. I have seen the official version and the other in the *Independent*. I shall apologise to the people of Aligarh if I find that I am in the wrong, but the *Independent* correspondent's version is evasive and attempts to prove much. It does not deny incendiarism on the part of the mob and seeks entirely to exculpate the latter. I shall require over-whelmingly strong evidence to prove that the authorities in Aligarh acted wantonly and maliciously without the slightest provocation. I am quite prepared to find that the police wanted to prevent an aggressive demonstration on the part of the mob, and that, in so doing, they lost self-restraint and opened fire. My point however is that there should be no aggressiveness on our part at all. Non-co-operators must not bully or threaten. We are developing quite an irresistible courage which comes only from waiting upon God, in other words, from absolute faith in the righteousness of our cause. If we want to finish our programme successfully, and during this year, we have no time for bluster or a show of force. We must be scrupulously truthful to our pledge. We can succeed beyond all expectation, only if we remain non-violent in thought, word and deed. It need not be our final creed, but it must be our present creed for the attainment of our goal. There need be no difficulty in our not thinking or speaking ill of our adversary as we have found it easy

One great stumbling block is that we have neglected music. Music means rhythm, order. Its effect is electrical. It immediately soothes. I have seen, in European countries, a resourceful superintendent of police by starting a popular song controlling the mischievous tendencies of mobs. Unfortunately like our Shastras, music has been the prerogative of the few, either the batter of prostitutes or high class religious devotees. It has never become nationalised in the modern sense. If I had any influence with volunteer boy scouts and Seva Samiti organisations, I would make compulsory a proper singing in company of national songs. And to that end I should have great musicians attending every Congress or Conference and teaching mass music.

Much greater discipline, method and knowledge must be exacted from volunteers and no chance comer should be accepted as a full-fledged volunteer. He only hinders rather than helping. Imagine the consequence of the introduction of one untrained soldier finding his way into an army at war. He can disorganise it in a second. My greatest anxiety about non-co-operation is not the slow response of the leaders, certainly not the well-meant and even ill-meant criticism, never unadulterated

enough on the whole to restrain ourselves from doing ill to him. We must not use the pledge of non-violence and truth to cover violence and exaggeration, if not untruth. Nor must we be afraid to let our best comrades go to jail. I adhere to the belief so often expressed by me that Pandit Sundarlal and now Pandit Makhanlal are serving the community better, being in jail for the sake of conscience than they would have being free. Those who think otherwise, in my opinion, do not understand the dynamics of non-co-operation. The dynamic force behind this great movement is not vocal propaganda, but the silent propaganda carried on by the sufferings of the innocent victims of a mad Government.

repression. The movement will overcome these obstacles. It will go in even strength from them. But the greatest obstacle is that we have not yet emerged from the mobocratic stage. But my consolation lies in the fact that nothing is so easy as to train mobs, for the simple reason that they have no mind, no premeditation. They act in a frenzy. They repent quickly. Our organised Government does not repent of its fiendish crimes at Jallianwala, Lahore, Kasur, Aligarh, Ram Nagar &c. But I have drawn tears from repentant mobs at Gujranwalla and everywhere a frank acknowledgment of repentance from those who formed the mob during that eventful month of April. Non-co-operation I am therefore now using in order to evolve democracy And I respectfully invite all the doubting leaders to help by refusing to condemn, in anticipation of a process of national purification, training and sacrifice.

Next week I hope to give some illustrations of how in a moment order was evolved out of mob disorder. My faith in the people is boundless. Theirs is an amazingly responsive nature. Let not the leaders distrust them. This chorus of condemnation of non-co-operation when properly analysed means nothing less than distrust of the people's ability to control themselves. For the present I conclude this somewhat lengthy article by suggesting some rules for guidance and immediate execution.

1. There should be no raw volunteers accepted for big demonstrations. Therefore none but the most experienced should be at the head.

2. Volunteers should have a general instructions book on their persons.

3. At the time of demonstrations there must be a review of volunteers at which special instructions should be given.

4. At stations, volunteers should not all be centred at one point, namely, where the reception committee should be. But they should be posted at different points in the crowd.

5. Large crowds should never enter the station. They cannot but inconvenience traffic. There is as much honour in staying out as in entering the station.

6. The first duty of the volunteers should be to see that other passengers' luggage is not trampled upon.

7. Demonstrators ought not to enter the station long before the notified time for arrival.

8. There should be a clear passage left in front of the train for the passengers.

9. There should be another passage if possible half way through the demonstrators for the heroes to pass.

10. There should be no chain formed. It is humiliating.

11. The demonstrators must not move till the heroes have reached their coach or till they receive a prearranged signal from an authorised volunteer.

12. National cries must be fixed and must be raised not any how, at any time or all the time, but just on the arrival of the train, on the heroes reaching the coach and on the route at fair intervals. No objections need be raised to this on the score of the demonstration becoming mechanical and not spontaneous. The spontaneity will depend upon numbers, the response to the cries, above all the general look of the demonstrators not in the greatest number of noises or the loudest. It is

the training that a nation receives which characterises the nature of its demonstrations. A Mahomedan silently worshipping in his mosque is no less demonstrative than a Hindu temple goer making a noise either through his voice or his gong or both.

13. On the route the crowd must line and not follow the carriages. If pedestrians form part of the moving procession, they must noiselessly and in an orderly manner take their places and not at their own will join or abstain.

14. A crowd should never press towards the heroes but should move away from them.

15. Those on the last line or the circumference should never press forward but give away when pressure is directed towards them.

16. If there are women in the crowd they should be specially protected.

17. Little children should never be brought out in the midst of crowds.

18. At meetings volunteers should be dispersed among the crowd. They should learn flag and whistle signalling in order to pass instructions from one to another when it is impossible for the voice to carry.

19. It is no part of the audience to preserve order. They do so by keeping motionless and silent.

20. Above all, everyone should obey volunteers' instructions without question.

This list does not pretend to be exhaustive. It is merely illustrative and designed to stimulate thought and discussion. I hope that all the vernacular papers will translate this article.

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 22, 1920.)

I promised in my article on "Democracy vs. Mobocracy" to give some illustrations of my meaning out of my own experiences.* I was however unable, owing to the protracted Congress proceedings, to give those illustrations last week. I do so now. When we reached Madras, a huge crowd awaited us at the station. Our compartment was detached and fortunately drawn up in front of a reserved platform. What would have happened, if we had to alight together with the other passengers can be better imagined than described. But even on the reserved platform we were not able to get out for some time. The volunteers were in the way. Instead of dispersing themselves among the crowd and keeping it back, they clustered together to do us honour as they thought. The result was that the pressure was all directed towards where they and we were standing. And 'form a ring' has become the usual word of command. This forming a ring is a humiliating spectacle and yet it has become such an institution that even when there is no one else but volunteers 'a ring' is formed round the leader to be 'honoured'.

To proceed with my description, the crowd was large, the noises they made were so terrific that the directions given by the volunteers could not be heard at all. All was chaos. My poor toes were every moment in danger

* See page 759.

of being crushed to a pulp. I often very nearly lost my balance through the jostling of the very volunteers who were trying to protect me. And but for the very great care with which they guarded me and the assistance rendered to them by the stalwart Maulana Shaukat Ali, I would have fared much worse than I did. The atmosphere was suffocating. Thus struggling, it took us nearly three quarters of an hour to reach the motor car whereas ordinarily it need not have taken three minutes to walk out of the station to the porch. Having reached the car it was no easy job to get into it. I had to be shoved into it in the best manner possible. I certainly heaved a sigh of relief when I found myself in the car, and I thought that both the Maulana and I deserved the ovation we received from the crowd after the dangerous exercise we had gone through. With a little forethought this mobocracy, for such it was, could have been changed into a splendidly organised and educative demonstration. And it could have been rendered free of all risk to life. The experience of Madras was typical of many. We had an extraordinary experience at Erode on our way to Salem. I was fairly fagged out. My voice had become hoarse with speaking. As at many stations there was here too a surging crowd. It was thoroughly disorganised, though like everywhere else perfectly good humoured and respectful. I appealed to them not to make all kinds of unmusical noises, told them to disperse in an orderly manner as they had already seen us. I told them too that if they intended to take their share in the Khilafat and the Punjab struggle, they were expected to undergo discipline. I was able to reach

my voice to the most intelligent amongst them. I suggested that they should quietly rise, turn towards the station entrance and noiselessly retire. They listened, the rest followed and the station was cleared in two minutes' time. If the friends, who heard me, had haggled, argued, objected and insisted on shouting and remaining, the whole crowd would have done likewise and there would have been a pandemonium throughout the long time that the train stopped there.

I shall finish this description by giving the reverse of our experience at Jolarpet. We were travelling to Madras by the night train leaving Bangalore. We had been taking meetings at Salem during the day, mortoring to Bangalore, a distance of 125 miles from Salem, taking there a meeting in drenching rain and thereafter we had to entrain. We needed night's rest but there was none to be had. At almost every station of importance, large crowds had gathered to greet us. About midnight we reached Jolarpet junction. The train had to stop there nearly forty minutes or stopped that night all those terrible minutes. Maulana Shaukat Ali requested the crowd to disperse. But the more he argued, the more they shouted 'Maulana Shaukat Ali ki Jar' evidently thinking that the Maulana could not mean what he said. They had come from twenty miles' distance, they were waiting there for hours, they must have their satisfaction. The Maulana gave up the struggle, he pretended to sleep. The adorers thereupon mounted the foot-boards to have a peep at the Maulana. As the light in our compartment was put out they brought in lanterns. At last I thought I would try. I rose, went to the door. It was a signal

for a great shout of joy. The noise tore me to pieces. I was so tired. All my appeals proved fruitless in the end. They would stop for a while to renew the noise again. I shut the windows. But the crowd was not to be baffled. They tried to open the windows from outside. They must see us both. And so the tussle went on till my son took it up. He harrangued them, appealed to them for the sake of the other passengers. He produced some effect and there was a little less noise. Peeping however went on to the last minute. It was all well-meant, it was all an exhibition of boundless love, yet how cruel, how unreasonable! It was a mob without a mind. There were no intelligent men of influence among them and so nobody listened to anybody.

Before we can make real headway, we must train these masses of men who have a heart of gold, who feel for the country, who want to be taught and led. But a few intelligent, sincere, local workers are needed, and the whole nation can be organised to act intelligently, and democracy can be evolved out of mobocracy. This evolution is really the first step to successful, national non-cooperation.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE PEASANTS OF THE UNITED PROVINCES

(March 9, 1921.)

[We give below a free rendering of the Hindi instructions addressed by Mr. Gandhi to the peasants of the United Provinces during his visit to Oudh. Pundit Motilal

Nehru, in his capacity as President of the Kisan Sabha, has distributed them in thousands among the peasantry.*]

Attainment of Swaraj or redress of grievances is impossible unless the following rules are strictly observed.

1. We may not hurt any body. We may not use our sticks against anybody. We may not use abusive language or exercise any other undue pressure.

2. We may not loot shops.

* Writing on the relations between Zamindars and the ryots in U. P., Mr. Gandhi expressed thus in *Young India* of May 18, 1921 thus —

The Zamindars and the Ryots — Whilst the U. P. Government is crossing the bounds of propriety, and intimidating people, there is little doubt that the Kisans too are making wise use of their newly found power. In several Zamindari, they are said to have overstepped the mark, taken the law into their own hands and to have become impatient of anybody who would not do as they wish. They are abusing social boycott and are turning it into an instrument of violence. They are reported to have stopped the supply of water, barber, and other paid services to their Zamindars in some instances and even suspended payment of the rent due for them. The Kisan movement has received an impetus from non-co-operation, but it is anterior to and independent of it. Whilst we will not hesitate to advise the Kisans when the moment comes, to suspend payment of taxes to the Government, it is not contemplated that at any stage of non-co-operation we would seek to deprive the Zamindars of their rent. The Kisan movement must be confined to the improvement of the status of the Kisans and the betterment of the relations between the Zamindars and them. The Kisans must be advised scrupulously to abide by the terms of their agreement with the Zamindars, whether such agreement is written or inferred from custom. Where a custom or even a written contract is bad, they may not try to uproot it by violence or without previous reference to the Zamindars. In every case there should be a friendly discussion with the Zamindars and an attempt made to arrive at a settlement. Our capacity for Swaraj depends upon our capacity for solving, without reference to, or intervention of, the Government, all the varied and complex problems that must arise in the affairs of one of the biggest and the most ancient nations like ours.

3. We should influence our opponents by kindness, not by using physical force nor stopping their water supply nor the services of the barber and the washerman.

4. We may not withhold taxes from the Government or rent from the landlord.

5. Should there be any grievances against zamindars, they should be reported to Pundit Motilal Nehru and his advice followed.

6. It should be borne in mind that we want to turn Zamindars into friends.

7. We are not at the present moment offering civil disobedience ; we should, therefore, carry out all Government orders.

8. We may not stop railway trains nor forcibly enter them without tickets.

9. In the event of any of our leaders being arrested, we may not prevent his arrest nor create any disturbance. We shall not lose our cause by the Government arresting our leaders ; we shall certainly lose it, if we become mad and do violence.

10. We must abolish intoxicating drinks, drugs and other evil habits.

11. We must treat all women as mothers and sisters and respect and protect them.

12. We must promote unity between Hindus and Muslims.

13. As amongst Hindus we may not regard any one as inferior or untouchable. There should be the spirit of equality and brotherhood among all. We should regard all the inhabitants of India as brothers and sisters.

14. We may not indulge in gambling.

15. We may not steal.

16. We may not tell an untruth on any account whatsoever. We should be truthful in all our dealings.

17. We should introduce the spinning wheel in every home and all—male and female—should devote their spare time to spinning. Boys and girls should also be taught and encouraged to spin for four hours daily.

18. We should avoid the use of all foreign cloth and wear cloth woven by the weavers from yarn spun by ourselves.

19. We should not resort to law courts but should have all disputes settled by private arbitration.

The most important thing to remember is to curb anger, never to do violence and even to suffer violence done to us.

SOCIAL BOYCOTT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*December 8, 1920.*)

A correspondent writes from Hyderabad (Sind) a letter* regarding boycott which I gladly publish. He refers to what is alleged to have happened to Mr. Khaparde. Hyderabad (Sind) is a far cry from Amraoti. I do not know that Mr. Khaparde has been put to all the inconveniences that the correspondent relates. Mr. Khaparde is well able to take care of himself. I hope, however, that there is much exaggeration in the information supplied to the correspondent about the treatment.

Nevertheless, the issue raised by the correspondent is

* Omitted in this collection.

important and serious. It would be a dangerous thing if, for differences of opinion, we were to proclaim social boycott.

It would be totally opposed to the doctrine of non-violence to stop the supply of water and food.* This battle of non-co-operation is a programme of propaganda by reducing profession to practice, not one of compelling others to yield obedience by violence direct or indirect. We must try patiently to convert our opponents. If we wish to evolve the spirit of democracy out of slavery, we must be scrupulously exact in our dealings with opponents. We may not replace the slavery of the Government by that of the non-co-operationists. We must concede to our opponents the freedom we claim for ourselves and for which we are fighting. The stoutest co-operationist will bend to the stern realities of practice if there is real response from the people.

But there is a non-violent boycott which we shall be bound to practise, if we are to make any impression.

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of December 22, 1920 —

The men are impatient and grievously err as they are reported to have done at Delhi and in Bengal. It was cruel and sinful to deny the rights of burial to the corpse of a man whom the so-called non-co-operators (if they were non-co-operators) disliked. It was filthy to throw, at a place in East Bengal, night soil on a candidate who had stood for election as a council member, or to cut the ears of a voter for daring to exercise his vote. These are just the ways of defeating our own purpose. Non-co-operation is non-violent not merely in regard to the Englishmen and Government officials. It has to be equally so as between ourselves. A co-operator is as much entitled to freedom of action, speech and thought as the tallest among non-co-operators. Non-co-operation is directed against all slavery. Every non-co-operator therefore retards the function of his cause by resorting to violence. It is a sure sign of want of faith in his mission.

We must not compromise with what we believe to be an untruth, whether it resides in a white skin or a brown. Such boycott is political boycott. We may not receive favours from the new councillors. The voters, if they are true to their pledge, will be bound to refrain from making use of the services of those whom they have declined to regard as their representatives. They must ratify their verdict by complete abstention from any encouragement of the so-called representatives.

The public will be bound, if they are non-co-operationists, to refrain from giving these representatives any prestige by attending their political functions or parties.

I can conceive the possibility of non-violent social ostracism under certain extreme conditions, when a defiant minority refuses to bend to the majority, not out of any regard for principle, but from sheer defiance or worse. But that time has certainly not arrived. Ostracism of a violent character, such as the denial of the use of public wells is a species of barbarism, which I hope will never be practised by any body of men having any desire for national self-respect and national uplift. We will free neither Islam nor India by processes of coercion, whether among ourselves or against Englishmen.

SOCIAL BOYCOTT.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 16, 1921.)

Non-co-operation being a movement of purification, is bringing to the surface all our weaknesses as also excesses

of even our strong points. Social boycott is an age-old institution. It is coeval with caste. It is the one terrible sanction exercised with great effect. It is based upon the notion that a community is not bound to extend its hospitality or service to an excommunicate. It answered when every village was a self-contained unit, and the occasions of recalcitrancy were rare. But when opinion is divided, as it is to-day, on the merits of non-co-operation, when its new application is having a trial, a summary use of social boycott in order to bend a minority to the will of the majority is a species of unpardonable violence. If persisted in, such boycott is bound to destroy the movement. Social boycott is applicable and effective when it is not felt as a punishment and accepted by the object of boycott as a measure of discipline. Moreover, social boycott to be admissible in a campaign of non-violence must never savour of inhumanity. It must be civilised. It must cause pain to the party using it, if it causes inconvenience to its object. Thus, depriving a man of the services of a medical man, as is reported to have been done in Jhansi, is an act of inhumanity tantamount in the moral code to an attempt to murder. I see no difference in murdering a man and withdrawing medical aid from a man who is on the point of dying. Even the laws of war, I apprehend, require the giving of medical relief to the enemy in need of it. To deprive a man of the use of an only village well is notice to him to quit that village. Surely, non-co-operators have acquired no right to use that extreme pressure against those who do not see eye to eye with them. Impatience and intolerance will surely kill this great religious movement. We may not

make people pure by compulsion. Much less may we compel them by violence to respect our opinion. It is utterly against the spirit of democracy we want to cultivate.

There are no doubt serious difficulties in our way. The temptation to resort to social boycott is irresistible when a defendant, who submits to private arbitration, refuses to abide by its award. Yet it is easy to see that the application of social boycott is more than likely to arrest the splendid movement to settle disputes by arbitration which, apart from its use as a weapon in the armoury of non-co-operation, is a movement fraught with great good to the country. People will take time before they accommodate themselves to private arbitration. Its very simplicity and inexpensiveness will repel many people even as palates jaded by spicy foods are repelled by simple combinations. All awards will not always be above suspicion. We must therefore rely upon the intrinsic merits of the movement and the correctness of awards to make itself felt.

It is much to be desired if we can bring about a complete *voluntary* boycott of law courts. That one event can bring about Swaraj. But it was never expected that we would reach completion in any single item of non-co-operation. Public opinion has been so far developed as to recognise the courts as signs not of our liberty but of our slavery. It has made it practically impossible for lawyers to practice their profession and be called popular leaders.

Non-co-operation has greatly demolished the prestige of law courts and to that extent of the Government. The disintegrating process is slowly but surely going on. Its velocity will suffer diminution if violent methods are adopted to hasten it. This government of ours is armed

to the teeth to meet and check forces of violence. It possesses nothing to check the mighty forces of non-violence. How can a handful of Englishmen resist a voluntary expression of opinion accompanied by the voluntary self-denial of thirty crores of people?

I hope, therefore, that non-co-operation workers will beware of the snares of social boycott. But the alternative to social boycott is certainly not social intercourse. A man who defies strong clear public opinion on vital matters is not entitled to social amenities and privilege. We may not take part in his social functions such as marriage feasts, we may not receive gifts from him. But we dare not deny social service. The latter is a duty. Attendance at dinner parties and the like is a privilege which it is optional to withhold or extend. But it would be wisdom to err on the right side and to exercise the weapon even in the limited sense described by me on rare and well-defined occasions. And in every case the user of the weapon will use it at his own risk. The use of it is not as yet in any form a duty. No one is entitled to its use if there is any danger of hurting the movement..

A SET BACK

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*May 4, 1921.*)

If the facts reported in the press are substantially correct, Malegaon non-co-operators have been false to their creed, their faith, and their country. They have put back the hands of the clock of progress. Non-violence is the

rock on which the whole structure of non-co-operation is built. Take that away and every act of renunciation comes to naught, as artificial fruit is no more than a showy nothing. The murder of the men who were evidently doing duty was, if the report is correct, deliberate. It was a cowardly attack. Certain men wilfully broke the law, and invited punishment.

There could be no justification for resentment of such imprisonment. Those who commit violence of the Malegaon type are the real co-operators with the Government. The latter will gladly lose a few officers if thereby they could kill non-co-operation. A few more such murders and we shall forfeit the sympathy of the masses. I am convinced that the people will not tolerate violence on our part. They are by nature peaceful and they have welcomed non-co-operation because it is deliberately non-violent.

What must we do then ? We must ceaselessly preach against violence alike in public and in private. We must not show any sympathy to the evil-doers. We must advise the men who have taken part in the murders to surrender themselves if they are at all repentant. The workers must be doubly careful in their talks. They must cease to talk of the evil of the Government and the officials, whether European or Indian. Bluster must give place to the work of building up put before the nation by the Congress. We must be patient if there is no response to the demand for men, money, and munitions. All police orders must be strictly obeyed. There should be no processions or hartals when known workers are prosecuted or imprisoned. If we welcome imprisonments of

innocent men, as we must, we ought to cultivate innocence and congratulate ourselves when we are punished for holding opinions, or for doing things that we consider it our duty to do, *i. e.*, for spinning, or collecting funds or getting names for the Congress register. There should be no civil disobedience. We have undertaken to stand the gravest provocation and remain non-violent. Let us be careful lest the hour of our triumph be, by our folly, the hour of our defeat and humiliation. I implicitly subscribe to the test suggested by the *Times of India*. It may be recognised that as a movement relying ostensibly upon soul force, the only test of its value must be in the absolute sincerity of its upholders. Once let that sincerity fall under justifiable suspicion and those forces are let in which must inevitably end in its moral ruin.

MALEGAON MISBEHAVIOUR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*May 11, 1920.*)

I observe that there is a tendency to minimise the guilt of the non-co-operators at Malegaon. No amount of provocation by the Sub-Inspector could possibly justify retaliation by the non-co-operators. I am not examining the case from the legal standpoint. I am concerned only with the non-co-operator's. He is bound under his oath not to retaliate even under the gravest provocation. We have the brilliant instance of Sardars Lachmansingh and Dalipsingh and their party. If we are true non-co-operators, we must develop the power of dying as they died. I would

have hailed with joy the immolation of Malegaon non-co-operators if they had died bravely and without providing any justification. That would have brought the day of India's freedom nearer. As it was, who gave the first provocation, again, from the non-co-operator's standpoint? Did they or did they not try to overawe the police? These delirious demonstrations * when any of us is arrested are, as I have already observed before, an unseemly exhibition of our anxiety to avoid imprisonment. We have chosen a standard of judgment for ourselves and we must abide by it. I retain the opinion that the non-co-operators, so far as the facts hitherto brought to light show, committed a grievous breach of the code of non-violent non-co-operation. I would ask the public who are interested in the Khilafat or Swaraj, religiously to refrain from *all* demonstration over the arrest or imprisonment of even their dearest leaders. I would

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of August 11, 1921 —

Demonstrations—It is now easy enough to understand how the incendiarism could have taken place at Malegaon and even at Aligarh. An undisciplined crowd had gathered. Such a crowd contains mischief-makers waiting for an opportunity. And when a crowd is excited, it yields passive obedience, that is it is driven by the momentary impulse. We therefore play into the hands of the 'enemy' when we organise at trails demonstrations we cannot control. Our purpose to-day is to establish a calm and non-violent yet determined atmosphere. All our determination is frittered away under an unexpected fire opened by disciplined soldiers. Therefore we must scrupulously avoid all demonstrations over imprisonments. We must let go unnoticed all whom the Government wants. As soon as we have acquired sufficient self-control, we shall be ready for civil disobedience and Swaraj. This self-control can only be attained by complete Swadeshi. A boycott of foreign cloth and effort put forth to manufacture the required quantity of Khadi will give us a self-confidence which nothing else can.

hold it no honour to me for the public to proclaim a hartal or hold meetings if I was arrested or Maulana Shaukat Ali for that matter. I would welcome and expect in any such event a complete immediate boycott of all foreign cloth, a more energetic adoption of the spinning wheel, a more vigorous collection on behalf of the Tilak Swaraj Fund and a flooding of Congress offices for registration as members. I would certainly expect the emptying of Government schools and colleges and more suspensions of practice by lawyers. Killing officers and burning buildings will not only retard the advent of Swaraj and the righting of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, but are likely to lead to utter demoralisation of the nation. We must therefore scrupulously avoid all occasions which would excite the passions of the mob and lead them into undesirable or criminal conduct.

OUR SHORTCOMINGS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*June 22, 1921.*)

Whilst Dr. Pollen's criticism,* by reason of its ignorance and arrogant assumptions, irritates without helping, an Englishman in Madras, who signs himself 'John Bull', sends the following very helpful and candid criticism:—

Permit an Englishman to send you a few words of appreciation of your work and career, and a few words of explanation. I am moved to do this by your remarks in *Young India* on Lord Reading's speech. You have, it seems to me, the most valuable capacity of seeing and stating the simple

* See page 382.

truth, in greater measure than any other living politician. You see the root of the trouble in India in the fact that the European in India looks down upon the Indian as an inferior. So do I. But what I want you to consider is first, "Whose fault is that?" And second, "How can it be mended?"

Can the English in India help regarding Indians in the mass, as inferior to his own people? Those of us who try to see things as they are, what do we see? We find that the Indian is inferior to the Englishman as a servant or employee. He is less conscientious, he takes more holidays, he requires to be watched. We find, he is inferior to the Englishman as a master or employer, he has less justice and less generosity. We find him inferior as an animal, he succumbs to disease, he (if of higher class) usually shirks exercise, and is very frequently a worn out old man, where he ought to be in his prime. His children die in swarms. Here in Madras, the deaths of children under five frequently are half as numerous as the births. He is inferior as a citizen, very seldom does he resist any pressure towards bribe-giving. He boasts of his humanity, because he will not kill animals, but he lets even cows starve to death, and nowhere in any civilised land are horses and oxen so ill-treated as in India. In order to maintain purity of married life, he has built up the institutions pre-puberty marriage and perpetual widowhood, and yet venereal disease is even more rampant in India than in England, and in the name of religion little girls are trained up to prostitution. What record can India show of lives devoted to non-Indian humanity like all those British men and women who (to take one example only) are at work now in what were enemy countries in the war? If India had obtained complete Sawaraj, and were in danger, would five million men out of every forty-five millions of population voluntarily enlist in her armies?

Out of her vast population, how few are the great men India has produced—three living, Tagore, Bose and Gandhi—an extraordinarily rich crop for India! The population of England in the time of Queen Elizabeth was no greater than that of Mysore to-day.

All this may seem a very one-sided and mistaken view to you. Probably it is. But how can an Englishman help seeing the comparison between English and Indian in some such light as that?

If so, the remedy is in Indian hands, and not in ours. You are already pointing the way. I do not like your term "Non-co-operation," and it does not seem to me to express your meaning. I should prefer "Independent action." Let Indians abolish untouchability let them exercise restraint in marital relations, and not procreate millions of children doomed to early

death, let Brahmins learn at school to spin and weave and cease to despise manual labour, let India have one common language spoken and understood from Kashmir to Comorin, whatever local vernaculars are permitted to survive. When there is something to be done, let Indians put their hands to plough, and not merely say, "The Government must . . ." "These things you have preached, and if all the people who shout "Gandhiji-kī Jai," will do them, Englishman will speedily entertain much more respect for Indians than they feel at present. When these things are done, there are plenty more to do. Most important of all, perhaps, is to rebel against the tyranny of ancient custom, when it is no longer felt to be right or necessary. You will no doubt be able to point out one task after another. Meanwhile, we wait and see. Will that crore of rupees be paid up? Will the twenty lakhs of charkhas be obtained, and if so, will they be used? Will non-co-operators learn to maintain self-discipline and abstain from riot? Will Gandhi cease calling a Government consisting of men who, on the average, are more ready to make sacrifices for the service of India than the average Indian is—satanic? Will the temperance crusade lead to any better result than unbridled illicit drinking?

If we find these questions answered in the affirmative, if—but shall we?

The English are ready to give respect, when it is earned. Do not complain that English do not respect Indians; complain instead that Indians have not commanded respect.

For my own part, I believe you are accomplishing and will accomplish great things. "Man lives by admiration, hope and love" On these, great nations are built up. May India be one.

'John Bull's' letter shows, that the writer has attempted to understand the movement. Much of his criticism is not wholly undeserved. 'John Bull' has given the experience of the average Englishman. His generalisations in my opinion cannot be sustained. His experience is confined to a microscopic minority of Indians, drawn to the cantonments from ambitious motives, and by no means representing the mass of the people. In my opinion, based upon an extensive experience of both the races, man for man the Indian is in no way inferior, in all that matters, to any other race in the world. That as animals we are inferior

Englishmen, must be admitted. But that is due more largely to the climate than to anything else. The charge of indifference to the welfare of our animals can also, I think, be easily sustained. I do not believe, that except in large towns, we suffer more from venereal diseases than the other races. Dedication of girls to prostitution is certainly a serious blot on our culture. If Indians were trained in the same manner as Englishmen, and if India was similarly situated as England she would give quite a good account of herself. But we have a different culture, which I hope we will retain to the end of time. India's temperament is not warlike. She would refuse to see any greatness in sending her millions to the trenches for the purpose of killing fellow-men, even though the latter might be in error. India including her Mussalman population, is in my opinion more fitted for self-suffering than for inflicting suffering upon others. It is in this belief, that I have ventured to offer to her non-co-operation as a remedy for her many ills. Whether she will really respond or not, remains to be seen. If it has been taken up purely from revengeful motives, it will fail. If it has been taken up, as I believe it has been, for the purpose of self-purification and self-sacrifice, it is bound to succeed. That Indians are not a nation of cowards, is proved by the personal bravery and daring of her martial races, whether Hindu, Mussalman, Sikh or Gurkha. My point is, that the spirit of fighting is foreign to India's soil, and that probably she has a higher part to play in the evolution of the world. Time alone can show what is to be her destiny.

But 'John Bull' is entitled to treat all I have said in

answer as so much special pleading. I would far rather, that we took such criticism as a friendly warning, and that we began to rid ourselves of all our impurities. I agree with 'John Bull', that it is better to command respect than to grumble about want of it. And that is exactly the reason, why India has taken up non-cooperation. The writer does not like the word. I would reject it to-day, if I could find a better. But it is the only word that meets the case. We have co-operated long enough in our own degradation. It is our duty to refuse to do so any longer. One need not even apportion the blame. The fact stands, as 'John Bull' has properly admitted, that the average Englishman has little respect for us. We must therefore stand aside, till we and they *feel* as equals.

But there is the other side to 'John Bull's' argument. His attitude betrays race-repugnance. Assuming the shortcomings to exist, just as they are described by the writer, is that a reason for looking down upon Indians as inferior beings? Or, does not the doctrine of equality require mutual regard, irrespective of the possession of the same qualities? Does not 'John Bull' commit the same error, that many Hindus do regarding the 'untouchables'? If I am right in calling the spirit of untouchability satanic, am I less right in calling the cult of English superiority also by the same name? Do Englishmen behave towards their less fortunate brethren, in the same way as they behave towards Indians? Do they not consider themselves to be born to rule, and Indians born to obey, even as Hinduism is said to have consigned the 'untouchables' to perpetual subjection? My whole

soul has risen against the existing system of Government, because I believe that there is no real freedom for India under the British connection, if Englishmen cannot give up the fetish of their pre-destined superiority. This attitude of Englishmen has deprived the tallest Indian of any chance of rising to his full height, and therefore, in spite of all the good intentions of individual English administrators, we have really lost in our own estimation, so much so that many of us have come to believe that we require a long course of training under the English, whereas it is my conviction that we are to-day quite fit to govern ourselves, and therefore we must resolutely refuse to co-operate with them in the administration of reforms that fall short of full self-government. We will no doubt make mistakes, more perhaps than now. We shall learn through our mistakes, never by being forcibly prevented from making them.

PRISON LIFE.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1920.)

I cannot sufficiently warn non-co-operation prisoners against the danger of hastily embarking upon hunger strikes in their prisons. It cannot be justified as a means for removing, irksome gaol restrictions. For a gaol is nothing if it does not impose upon us restrictions which we will not submit to in ordinary life. A hunger strike would be justified when inhumanity is practised, or food

issued which offends one's religious sense or which is unfit for human consumption. It should be rejected when it is offered in an insulting manner. In other words it should be rejected when acceptance would prove us to be slaves of hunger.

Mr. Sengupta, the leader of Chittagong and the soul of the A. B. Railway strike movement, has at last got his imprisonment with eighteen others. It is not a long spell. He and his companions have got only three months rigorous imprisonment. Mrs. Sengupta writing about her husband says he was quite happy over the prospect of being sentenced. I was told whilst in Chittagong that its citizens had nearly attained Swaraj. 'Nearly' is an elusive word. It may be next to completion or it may be farthest away from it, and yet, 'nearly' may be used for either state. But if the people of Chittagong want to attain Swaraj completely, they must spin and weave all their cloth in their own homes and offer no temptation to dealers in foreign cloth. Its courts must be deserted and the Government schools must be empty. In that case the citizens may not even need civil disobedience. But they may not have that measure of strength or unanimity. Still if the majority desire Swaraj, it cannot be stopped by the minority. The majority however in order to establish its authority must go through the fire of suffering, by means of civil disobedience.

Let there be no mistake about the meaning of these imprisonments. They are not courted with the object of embarrassing the Government, though as a matter of fact they do. They are courted for the sake of discipline and suffering. They are courted because we consider it to be

wrong to be free under a Government we hold to be wholly bad. No stone should be left unturned by us to make the Government realise that we are in no way amenable to its control. And no Government has yet tolerated such open defiance however respectful it may be. It might safely therefore be said that if we are yet outside the prison walls, the cause lies as much with us as with the Government. We are moving cautiously in our corporate capacity. We are still voluntarily obeying many of its laws. There was, for instance, nothing to prevent me from disregarding the Madras Government's order and courting arrest, but I avoided it. There is nothing to prevent me save my prudence or weakness from going without permission into the barracks and being arrested for trespass. I certainly believe the barracks to be the nation's property and not that of a Government which I no longer recognise as representative of the people. Thus there is an apparent inconsistency between the statement on the one hand that it is painful to remain outside the prison walls under a bad Government and this deliberate avoidance on the other hand of arrest upon grounds which are not strictly moral but largely expedient. We thus avoid imprisonment, because first we think that the nation is not ready for complete civil revolt, secondly we think that the atmosphere of voluntary obedience and non-violence has not been firmly established, and thirdly we have not done any constructive corporate work to inspire self-confidence. We therefore refrain from offering civil disobedience amounting to peaceful rebellion, but court imprisonment merely in the ordinary pursuit of our programme and in

defence of complete freedom of opinion and action short of revolt.

Thus it is clear that our remaining outside the gaols of a bad government has to be justified upon very exceptional grounds, and that our Swaraj is attained when we are in gaol or when we have bent the Government to our will. Whether therefore the Government feel embarrassed or happy over our incarceration, the only safe and honourable place for us is the prison. And if this position be accepted, it follows that when imprisonment comes to us in the ordinary discharge of our duty, we must feel happy because we feel stronger, because we pay the price of due performance of duty. And if exhibition of real strength is the best propaganda, we must believe that every imprisonment strengthens the people and thus bring Swaraj nearer.

That imprisonments instead of producing demoralisation, act as an incentive to healthier national growth is evidenced by two letters received from accurate observers. A friend writes from Barisal: "East Bengal is indebted to Pir Badshah Mian's arrest for the Hindu-Muslim unity which is now quite firm and the boycott of foreign cloth which is now complete among the masses." Equally emphatic is the testimony from Andhradesha. The Andhra letter says. "The real swadeshi spirit has not yet seized the hearts of the people though there is ample evidence of growing conviction in favour of the movement. In many places the required *Khadi* is not available. The weavers are not yet quite willing to weave the swadeshi yarn, and for those that are willing there is not adequate supply of yarn. One thing that seems to

accelerate the progress is the policy of repression adopted by the Government. Many a Sleepy Hollow has been roused to activity by the arrest and imprisonment of some one or other of the Congress workers, and if these arrests and imprisonments are made on a large scale, there will undoubtedly be speedier progress in all directions. As we go on, we find apprehension of violence growing less and less." Every one who writes to me from Karachi testifies to the growing strength of the people side by side with their growing discipline and self-restraint and a growing adoption of Swadeshi. And all this, because the distinguished prisoners are being tried in Karachi. This trial is an object-lesson to the Government and the people in non-violence coupled with courage bordering on defiance. 'We have no respect for courts' was for the first time heard at Karachi in a British Indian court of law. What is more, the judge is powerless to deal with this open contempt of court. Why? Because the big bulky brusque Shaukat Ali who uttered the sentiment had no feeling against Kennedy the man. He showed real fellow-feeling for the man in the judge by letting him know that he loathed the system which he was blindly encouraging.

The logical result of all this reasoning is that we must quickly organise ourselves for courting arrests wholesale, and that not rudely, roughly or blusteringly, certainly never violently, but peacefully, quietly, courteously humbly, prayerfully and courageously. By the end of December every worker must find himself in goal unless he is specially required in the interest of the struggle not to make the attempt. Let it be remembered that in civil

disobedience we precipitate arrests and therefore may keep few outside the attempt.

Those only can take up civil disobedience, who believe in willing obedience even to irksome laws imposed by the state so long as they do not hurt their conscience or religion, and are prepared equally willingly to suffer the penalty of civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil has to be absolutely non-violent, the underlying principle being the winning over of the opponent by suffering, *i. e.*, love.

For the purpose of the Khilafat, the Panjab or Swaraj, civil resisters must implicitly believe in the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity based not upon expediency but upon real affection. Civil resisters must believe in Swadeshi and therefore use only handspun. Humanly speaking, if not even one out of the two hundred and fifty districts of India is thus ready, I consider the attainment of Swaraj during this year nearly impossible. If one district can be found where ninety per cent. of the population have completely boycotted foreign cloth and are manufacturing all the cloth required by them by hand spinning and hand weaving, if the whole of the population of that district, whether Hindu, Mussalman, Parsi, Shikh, Christian or Jewish, is living in perfect amity, if the whole of its Hindu population is purged of the sin of untouchability and if at least one in every ten of its inhabitants is capable of suffering imprisonment or even mounting the gallows, and if while that district is civilly, peacefully and honourably resisting the Government, the rest of India remains non-violent and united and prosecutes the programme of Swadeshi, I hold it to be perfectly possible to

establish Swaraj during this year. I shall hope, that there are several such districts ready. In any case the method now to adopt is for workers to concentrate on and develop their own districts without reference to the rest. They must not invite imprisonment till they are ready, nor must they avoid it if it comes to them unsought. They should make no speeches but simply finish the Swadeshi programme in a businesslike manner. Where workers find no response from their districts, they must not get disheartened but should simply become expert carders, spinners and weavers. Their outturn will be their best and whole work whilst their neighbours are thinking what to do.

A MODEL PRISONER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 29, 1921.)

“Should non-co-operators shout Bande Mataram inside jails against jail discipline which may excite ordinary prisoners to violence, should non-co-operators go on hunger strike for the improvement of food or other conveniences, should they strike work inside jails on *hartal* days and other days? Are non-co-operators entitled to break rules of jail discipline unless they affect their conscience?” Such is the text of a telegram I received from a non-co-operator friend in Calcutta. From another part of India when a friend, again a non-co-operator, heard of the indiscipline of non-co-operator prisoners, he asked me to write on the necessity of observ-

ing jail discipline. As against this I know prisoners who are scrupulously observing in a becoming spirit all the discipline imposed upon them.

It is necessary, when thousands are going to jail, to understand exactly the position a non-co-operator prisoner can take up consistently with his pledge of non-violence. Non-co-operation when its limitations are not recognised, becomes a licence instead of being a duty and therefore becomes a crime. The dividing line between a right and wrong is often so thin as to become indistinguishable. But it is a line that is breakable and unmistakable.

What is then the difference between those who find themselves in jails for being in the right and those who are there for being in the wrong? Both wear often the same dress, eat the same food and are subject outwardly to the same discipline. But whilst the latter submit to discipline most unwillingly and would commit a breach of it secretly, and even openly if they could, the former will willingly and to the best of their ability conform to the jail discipline and prove worthier and more serviceable to their cause than when they are outside. We have observed that the most distinguished among the prisoners are of greater service inside the jails than outside. The co-efficient of service is raised to the extent of the strictness with which jail discipline is observed.

Let it be remembered that we are not seeking to destroy jails as such. I fear that we shall have to maintain jails even under Swaraj. It will go hard with us, if we let the real criminals understand that they will be set free or be very much better treated when Swaraj is established. Even in reformatories by which I would like to replace

every jail under Swaraj, discipline will be exacted. Therefore we really retard the advent of Swaraj if we encourage indiscipline. Indeed the swift programme of Swaraj has been conceived on the supposition that we being a cultured people are capable of evolving high discipline within a short time.

Indeed whilst on the one hand civil disobedience authorises disobedience of unjust laws or unmoral laws of a state which one seeks to overthrow, it requires meek and willing submission to the penalty of disobedience and therefore cheerful acceptance of the jail discipline and its attendant hardships.

It is now therefore clear that a civil resister's resistance ceases and his obedience is resumed as soon as he is under confinement. In confinement he claims no privileges because of the civility of his disobedience. Inside the jail by his exemplary conduct he reforms even the criminals surrounding him, he softens the hearts of jailors and others in authority. Such meek behaviour springing from strength and knowledge ultimately dissolves the tyranny of the tyrant. It is for this reason that I claim that voluntary suffering is the quickest and the best remedy for the removal of abuses and injustices.

It is now manifest that shouts of *Bande Mataram* or any other in breach of jail discipline are unlawful for a non-co-operator to indulge in. It is equally unlawful for him to commit a stealthy breach of jail regulations. A non-co-operator will do nothing to demoralise his fellow prisoners. The only occasion when he can openly disobey jail regulations or hunger-strike is when an attempt is made to humiliate him or when the warders themselves

break, as they often do, the rules for the comfort of prisoners or when food that is unfit for human consumption is issued as it often is. A case for civil disobedience also arises when there is interference with any obligatory religious practice.

THE SIMLA VISIT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 25, 1921.)

Many are asking why I waited upon His Excellency the Viceroy.* Some inquire why the author of non-co-operation should seek to see the Viceroy † All want to know the result of the interview. I like the rigorous scrutiny of the non-co-operators, who more than Caesar's wife must be

* Soon after Lord Reading's arrival in India, an interview was arranged by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya between H. E. Lord Reading and Mr. Gandhi. The interview which lasted some days took place at Simla in May 1921. For an authoritative report of the interview see following pages.

† Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of June 8, 1921.

Swaraj is Self-reliance—An esteemed friend, referring to the Viceregal interview, writes, "In my humble opinion, these interviews by non-co-operation leaders are, in the present circumstances, a political mistake, and may react on the movement. Back of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs, is the question of Swaraj, and India's Swaraj means the death of the Empire. Such a death may, in happy circumstances, mean its re-birth as a commonwealth of Nations. But where is the statesman to-day, with a free and generous view of world politics to look beyond British interests to the deeper values of Humanity? Victory of Swaraj movement, I conceive in terms of *self-reliance*, not of snatching some *concessions* from Lord Reading. As far as I can see, the hope for an escape from further confusion lies in escape from negotiations with the Government and becoming as a Nation, strong in the *will to Suffer*. A crucified India will be an India emancipated."

above suspicion. Non-co-operation is self-reliance. We want to establish Swaraj, not obtain it from others. Then why approach a Viceroy? This is all good, so far as it goes. And I should be a bad representative of our cause, if I went to anybody to ask for Swaraj. I have had the hardihood to say that Swaraj could not be granted even by God. We would have to earn it ourselves. Swaraj from its very nature is not in the giving of anybody.

But we want the world with us in our battle for freedom, we want the good will of every body. Our cause, we claim, is based upon pure justice. There are certain things we want Englishmen to surrender. All these things need mutual discussion and mutual understanding. Non-co-operation is the most potent instrument for creating world opinion in our favour. So long as we protested and co-operated, the world did not understand us. The erstwhile lion of Bengal in his early days used to relate the story of Englishmen, who asked him how many broken heads there were in India, if things were really so bad as he represented them to be. That was the way John Bull understood best. The other question the world has undoubtedly been asking is:—If things are really so bad, why do we co-operate with the Government in so pauper-

Whilst I do not agree with the writer that the interviews were a political mistake, the statement of our attitude is perfect. Our concern is not with what British statesmen will or will not do. Our business is always to endeavour to keep ourselves on the right track. Our aloofness must not be a sign of our haughtiness or disinclination to explain our view-points to our opponents. We must be prepared to approach the world, if we are firm in our own purpose. But I recognise, too, the force of the objection that there is danger in these interviews. Not being in the habit of having always a reserve of minimum on which there can be no surrender, we may easily slip.

ising and humiliating us? Now the world understands our attitude, no matter how weakly we may enforce it in practice. The world is now curious to know what ails us. The Viceroy represents a big world. His Excellency wanted to know why I, with whom co-operation was an article of faith, had non-co-operated. There must be something wrong with the Government or me.

And so His Excellency mentioned to Pandit Malaviyaji and to Mr. Andrews that he would like to see me and hear my views. I went to see the Panditji because he was anxious to meet me. I hold him in such high regard that I would not think, even if he was well and I could help it, of letting him come to me. As it was, he was too weak to travel to me. It was my duty to go to him. And when I heard the purport of his conversation with His Excellency, I do not require any persuasion to prompt me to ask for an appointment, if His Excellency wished to hear my views. I have devoted so much space to the reason for my seeking an appointment, for I wanted to make clear the limits and the meaning of non-co-operation.

It is directed not against men but against measures. It is not directed against the Governors, but against the system they administer. The roots of non-co-operation lie not in hatred but in justice, if not in love. Gladstone used to draw a sharp distinction between bad actions and bad men. He was accused of discourtesy for using some very strong expressions about the arts of his opponent. He put up the defence that he would have failed in his duty if he had not characterised their actions as they deserved to be, but he did not therefore mean to convey that his opponents deserved the epithets he had used about their

acts. As a youth, when I heard this defence, I could not appreciate it. Now with years of experience and use, I understand how true it was. I have found some of the truest of my friends capable of indefensible acts. For me there are few truer men than V. S. Shrinivas Shastriar, but his actions confound me. I do not think he loves me less because he believes that I am leading India down to the abyss.

And so I hope, this great movement of non-co-operation has made it clear to thousands, as it has to me, that whilst we may attack measures and systems, we may not, must not, attack men. Imperfect ourselves, we must be tender towards others and be slow to impute motives.

I therefore gladly seized the opportunity of waiting upon His Excellency and of assuring him that ours was a religious movement designed to purge Indian political life of corruption, deceit, terrorism and the incubus of white superiority.

The reader must not be too curious. He must not believe the so-called 'reports' in the press. The veil must remain drawn over the details of the conversation between the Viceroy and myself. But I may assure him that I explained, as fully as I knew, how the three claims—the Khilafat, the Punjab, and Swaraj, and gave him the genesis of non-co-operation. His Excellency heard me patiently, courteously and attentively. He appeared to me to be anxious to do only the right thing. We had a full discussion of the burning topics as between man and man. We discussed the question of non-violence, and it appeared to be common cause between us. Of that I may have to write more fully later.

But beyond saying that we were able to understand each other, I am unable to say that there was more in the interview. Some may think with me that a mutual understanding is in itself no small gain. Then, in that sense, the interview was a distinct success.

But at the end of all the long discussions, I am more than ever convinced that our salvation rests solely upon our own effort. His Excellency can only help or hinder. I am sanguine enough to think that he will help.

We must redouble our efforts to go through our programme. It is clearly as follows: (1) removal of untouchability, (2) removal of the drink curse, (3) ceaseless introduction of the spinning wheel, and the ceaseless production of Khaddar leading to an almost complete boycott of foreign cloth, (4) registration of Congress members, and (5) collection of Tilak Swaraj Fund.

No fierce propaganda is necessary for solidifying Hindu-Muslim unity and producing a still more non-violent atmosphere.

I have put untouchability in the forefront because I observe a certain remissness about it. Hindu non-cooperators may not be indifferent about it. We may be able to right the Khilafat wrong but we can never reach Swaraj, with the poison of untouchability corroding the Hindu part of the national body. Swaraj is a meaningless term, if we desire to keep a fifth of India under perpetual subjection, and deliberately deny to them the fruits of national culture. We are seeking the aid of God in this great purification movement, but we deny to the most deserving among His creatures the rights of humanity. Inhuman ourselves, we may not plead

before the Throne for deliverance from the inhumanity of others.

I put drink second, as I feel that God has sent the movement to us unsought. The greatest storm rages round it. The drink movement is fraught with the greatest danger of violence. But so long as this Government persists in keeping the drink shops open, so long must we persist in sleeplessly warning our erring countrymen against polluting their lips with drink.

The third place is assigned to the spinning wheel, though for me it is equally important with the first two. If we produce an effective boycott of foreign cloth during this year, we shall have shown cohesion, effort, concentration, earnestness, a spirit of nationality that must enable us to establish Swaraj.

Membership of the Congress is essential for the immense organisation required for dotting the country with the spinning wheels and for the manufacture and distribution of Khaddar, and for dispelling the fear that membership of the Congress may be regarded as a crime by the Government.

The fifth item, the Tilak Swaraj Fund, perpetuates the memory of the soul of Swaraj, and supplies us with the sinews of war.

We are under promise to ourselves to collect one crore rupees, register one crore members and introduce twenty lacs of spinning wheels in our homes by the 30th June. We shall postpone the attainment of our goal, if we fail to carry out the programme evolved at a largely attended meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, and arrived at after full consideration and debate.

THE BROTHERS' APOLOGY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 1, 1921.)

The brief statement * made by the Ali Brothers about some of their speeches will, I know, give rise to adverse criticism in whispers if not in public. It is best therefore to understand the apology. I am unable just now to go into the whole of the genesis, but I can safely inform the public that as soon as some friends brought passages in some of their speeches to my notice, I felt that they sounded harsh and seemed to be capable of being interpreted to mean incitement to violence. The air was thick with rumours of their arrest. No non-co-operator can afford to go to prison on a false issue, certainly not on a denial of his faith, *i. e.*, non-violence. I felt at once that I should draw their attention to the passages, and advise them to make a statement clearly defining their position. In the heat of the moment one is likely to use language which may bear a meaning never intended. When one disregards the fear of the law and fears only one's own conscience, one has to be doubly careful. But all the care in the world would sometimes fail to prevent a slip. The Ali Brothers carry a big burden on their shoulders. The prestige of Islam, in so far as they are responsible for it, will be measured by the credit they acquire for the most scrupulous regard for truth and honesty in their

* As a result of Mr. Gandhi's interview with Lord Reading, the Ali Brothers made a statement apologising, in consonance with their policy of non-violence, for the seeming intemperate language of some of their speeches.

dealings, and humility and courage of the highest order in their bearing. My 'alliance' with them, as our friendship has been called, is based upon my belief in their strict honesty, frankness, fearlessness courage and humility. I know that they are among much maligned men in India. All kinds of motives are attributed to them. They are said to be making me their easy tool. Time, I am sure, will disprove all these charges. But it was necessary that no hasty expression of theirs was used against them to damage their character or good faith. Nothing can be more hurtful to an honourable man than that he should be accused of bad faith. It was in order to safeguard them, in so far as it lay in their power, against any such imputation, that I advised them to make the statement now published.† In my opinion, by making it they have raised the tone and prestige of the Khilafat struggle they are leading. They have set an example to other workers. We are not to seek imprisonment out of bravado. The gaol is the gateway to liberty and honour, when innocence finds itself in it. The statement is a warning to all of us, that we who are fighting the battle for freedom and truth, must be most exact in our language. It would not be a bad thing to read our speeches or not to make any at all. One of the noblest of Mussalmans has imposed this restraint on himself. Maulana Abdul Bari is highly sensitive, and can be betrayed into using under excitement, language which he would not use in cooler moments, and which he often does not mean. At the suggestion of friends he has therefore undertaken as a rule not to speak in public at all. I cite this great example

† Not included in this book.

for all of us to follow. The Ali Brothers, by their frank statement, have given the guidance. We must not speak, but if we must, we must weigh our words well, lest we say thoughtlessly what we do not mean, and thereby hurt the cause we represent.

THE VICEROY SPEAKS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 8, 1921.)

What the Viceroy said with reference to Mr. Shafi's speech, is perhaps equally true of his own. For His Excellency described Mr. Shafi's speech as post-prandial oratory. I have been, in my early days, a student more or less accurate of the so-called historic speeches delivered by various Prime-Ministers at the Mansion House. They seemed to me to have always an air of unreality about them. And it grieves me, after having studied the speech of His Excellency the Viceroy, to have to say that this one also has the same air of unreality about it. Not that Lord Reading had intended to clothe his speech with any such air. On the contrary there are in it evident traces of his having laboured to deliver a true message to an expectant India. But the speech has failed, in my humble opinion, in doing so, because of the many limitations that the office of a Viceroy carries with it. He could not, for instance, override the tradition of claiming infallibility for British rule. He laid it down as a proposition, "beyond the possibility of a doubt," that "here in India there can be no trace, and must be no trace

of racial inequality." There is no more unreal proposition to the ear of the Indian than this, because his experience, be he ever so tall, belies it. Superiority of race is a passion, has become almost a religion with the average Englishman. Nor does he strive to conceal it from view. It obtrudes itself upon you in India as it does in the Colonies. It is written in the Statute Book. One misses in the Viceregal speech a frank recognition of the many failures of the past, and therefore a sincere desire for opening a new page.

If His Excellency, in my humble opinion, was hardly happy in his statement of the 'fundamental principle of British rule,' he was, I fear, even less so in his reference to Maulanas Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali. I recognise that he has been exceedingly cautious in his speech. He has attempted not to wound susceptibilities. As a matter of fact there was no question of wounding susceptibilities. He need not have spared the Maulanas where they might have erred. The statement made by the Brothers was instigated by me and me alone. It is an apology tendered to friends and not to the Government. It is made not to evade prosecution, but to put themselves right with their own conscience and with their friends. The assurance to them, therefore, that there would be no prosecution so long as they abided by their undertaking, was gratuitous, if not offensive. Lord Reading's Government is free to take up prosecution against the brothers at any moment they choose.

This campaign of non-co-operation has no reference to diplomacy, secret or open. The only diplomacy it admits of is the statement and pursuance of truth

at any cost. The Viceroy showed me the speeches. I realised that some passages in them did not read well. They were capable of being interpreted as an incitement to violence, and I realised that, prosecution or no prosecution, there was no doubt in my mind as to the advice I should tender to the Brothers. I venture to suggest to His Excellency, that if he is anxious to disarm non-co-operators, he will do so only by becoming undiplomatic and absolutely frank. The latter seek and need no shelter or protection, and I invite His Excellency to reciprocate by not shielding the offenders amongst the governing class.

Indeed, there is no room in the India of to-day and of to-morrow for a governing class. His Excellency will therefore find out his mistake, if he clings to the belief that "Indians will respond whole-heartedly to the just rule which we [British] intend to carry on". I venture to prophesy that it is not what the British intend that will count for the future destiny of India, but what the Indians themselves intend. And they are claiming more and more insistingly to govern themselves anyhow. Good government, they are coming to see, is no substitute for self-government.

The fear, then, is not about His Excellency's intentions, which I am convinced are good, but the fear is as to the ideal he is working for. He thinks of a high destiny which is in store for India at some indefinable period, whereas non-co-operators at any rate are of opinion, that India's high destiny is even now being frustrated by the existing system, which appears to them to be devised for her prolonged, if not perpetual subjection. Sometimes a difference of degree itself constitutes a differ-

ence of ideals. And I hold it to be an ideal totally different from India's, when anybody considers that whilst the distant goal must be one of freedom for India, its present state must be that of tutelage. Swaraj is India's birth-right, as the late Lokamanya Tilak truly said. And India throughout these long, long years, has been balked of her birth-right. No wonder that she has become impatient.

Lord Reading will, perhaps, now better appreciate the truth of the proposition he has read and heard; *viz.*, that any action of the Government that falls short of the fullest reparation, however good it may appear in itself, will, by non-co-operators at least, be charged with a bad motive, that of prolonging India's agony in her slave state. British rule, to-day, lies under a shadow. It is tainted with the blood of the innocent victims of Jalianwala, and with treachery towards Islam. And even as the purest milk poured into a poison bowl will be counted by every sane man as poison, so will every act of the British Government be judged in the light of its immediate past. The unrest of India can only be cured by dealing with the causes which have brought it about, never by covering the bitterness thereof by sweets of office or other privileges, no matter how tempting they may be, if they are not capable of dealing effectively with the causes themselves.

THAT APOLOGY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 15, 1921.)

The Ali Brothers' apology still continues to tax people's minds. I continue to receive letters expostulating with me for having gone to the Viceroy at all. Some consider that I have bungled the whole affair, others blame the Brothers for having for once weakened, and that in deference to me. I know that in a short while the storm will blow over. For, in spite of all I have heard and read, I feel that I did the right thing in responding to the Viceroy's wish to know my views. It would have been wrong on my part to have waited for a formal written invitation from His Excellency. I feel, too, that I gave the best advice possible in the interests of Islam and India, when I asked the Brothers to make the statement issued by them. The Ali Brothers have showed humility and courage of a high order in making the statement. They have shown that they are capable of sacrificing their pride and their all for the sake of their faith and country. They have served the cause by making the statement, as they would have injured it by declining to make it.

In spite of all that conviction in me, I am not surprised at the remonstrances I am receiving. They but show that the methods now being pursued are new, that the country will not surrender a tittle of its just demands, and for their satisfaction, it wishes to rely purely upon its own strength.

I give below the relevant parts of the strongest argu-

ment in condemnation of my advice and its acceptance by the Brothers. The letter, moreover, is written by one of the greatest among the non-co-operators. It is not written for publication at all. But I know the writer will not mind my sharing it with the reader. For I have no doubt that he represents the sentiments of several thoughtful non-co-operators. It is my humble duty to discuss the issues arising from the incident, and the implications of non-co-operation. It is only by patient reasoning that I hope to be able to demonstrate the truth, the beauty and the reasonableness of non-co-operation. Here then are the extracts:—

“The statement of the Brothers, taken by itself and read without reference to what has preceded and followed it, is a manly enough document. If in the heat of the moment they have said things which, they now find, may reasonably be taken to have a tendency to incite to violence, they have, in publishing their regret, taken the only honourable course open to public men of their position. I should also have been prepared to justify the undertaking they have given for the future, had that undertaking been addressed to those of their co-workers, who unlike themselves, do not believe in the cult of violence in any circumstances whatever. But the general words ‘public assurance and promise to all who may require it’ cannot in the circumstances leave any one in doubt as to the particular party who did require such ‘assurance and promise’ and at whose bidding it was given. The Viceroy’s speech has now made it perfectly clear, and we have the indisputable fact that the leader of the N.C.O. movement has been treating

with the Government, and has secured the suspension of the prosecution of the Brothers, by inducing them to give a public apology and an undertaking.

“In this view of the case,—and I fail to see what other view is possible—very serious questions affecting the whole movement arise for consideration. Indeed it seems to me that the whole principle of non-co-operation has been given away.

“I am not one of those who fight shy of the very name of Government, nor of those who look upon an eventual settlement with the Government as the only means of obtaining redress of our wrongs and establishing Swaraj. I believe in what you have constantly taught, *viz.*, that the achievement of Swaraj rests entirely and solely with us. At the same time, I do not, nor so far as I am aware do you, exclude the possibility of a settlement with the Government under proper conditions. Such settlement, however, can only relate to principles, and can have nothing to do with the convenience or safety of individuals. In a body of co-workers, you cannot make distinction between man and man, and the humblest of them is entitled to the same protection at the hands of the leaders as the most prominent. Scores, if not hundreds, of our men have willingly gone to gaol for using language far less strong than that indulged in by the Brothers. Some at least of these could easily have been saved by giving a similar apology and undertaking, and yet it never occurred to any one to advise them to do so. On the contrary their action was applauded by the leaders and the whole of the non-co-operationist press. The case, which more forcibly than any other comes to my mind at the moment,

is that of Hamid Ahmad, who has recently been sentenced at Allahabad to transportation for life and forfeiture of property. Is there any reason why this man should not be saved? I find Maulana Mahomed Ali pays him a high tribute in his Bombay speech of the 30th May. What consolation this tribute will bring to Hamid Ahmad from a man similarly situated who has saved himself by an apology and an undertaking, I cannot say. Then there are so many others rotting in gaol who have committed no offence, and a great many more already picked out for the same fate. Is it enough for us to send them our good wishes from the safe positions we ourselves enjoy?

“The Viceroy in his speech has made it clear that the only definite result of the several interviews you had with him, is the apology and the undertaking from the Brothers. You have also made it quite clear in your subsequent speeches, that our campaign is to go on unabated. It seems that no point involving any principle has been settled, except what needed no negotiating on either side, *viz.*, that there is to be no incitement to violence. I do not say that in this state of things there should have been no treating with the Government, though much can be said in support of that view. When it was found that the game had to be played out, it would have been quite legitimate for two such honourable adversaries as yourself and Lord Reading to agree to the rules of the game, so as to avoid foul play on either side. These rules would of course apply to all who took part in the game, and not to certain favoured individuals only. The most essential thing was to agree upon the weapons to be used. While certain local Government

profess to meet propaganda by propaganda, they are really using repression of the worst type. Many other similar points would, in my opinion, be proper subjects of discussion even when no agreement could be arrived at on the main issue.

“I hope you will not misunderstand me. I yield to none in my admiration of the sacrifices made by the Brothers, and consider it a high privilege to have their personal friendship. What has been preying upon my mind for some time past is, that we, who are directly responsible for many of our workers going to gaol and suffering other hardships, are ourselves practically immune. For example, the Government could not possibly have devised any form of punishment, which would cause some of us more pain and mental suffering, than sending innocent boys to gaol for distributing leaflets, while the author remained free. I think the time has come, when the leaders should welcome the opportunity to suffer, and stoutly decline all offers of escape. It is in this view of the case that I have taken exception to the action of the Ali Brothers. Personally I love them.”

The letter breathes nobility and courage. And those very qualities have led to a misapprehension of the situation. The unfortunate utterance of the Viceroy is responsible for the mis-understanding.

The apology of the Brothers is not made to the Government. It is addressed and tendered to friends, who drew their attention to their speeches. It was certainly not given ‘at the bidding of the Viceroy.’ I betray no confidence, when I say that it was not even suggested by him. As soon as I saw the speeches, I stated, in order to

prove the *bona fides* of the Brothers and the entirely non-violent character of the movement, that I would invite them to make a statement. There was no question of bargaining for their freedom. Having had my attention drawn to their speeches, I could not possibly allow them to go to goal (if I could prevent it) *on the ground of proved incitement to violence*. I have given the same advice to all the accused, and told them that if their speeches were violent, they should certainly express regret. A non-co-operator could not do otherwise. Had the Brothers been charged before a court of law, I would have advised them to apologise to the court for some of the passages in their speeches, which, in my opinion, were capable of being interpreted to mean incitement to violence. It is not enough for a non-co-operator not to mean violence; it is necessary that his speech must be capable of a contrary interpretation by reasonable men. We must be above suspicion. The success of the movement depends upon its retaining its absolute purity. I therefore suggest to the writer and to those who may think like him, that the whole principle of non-co-operation has not only not been 'given away' as the writer contends, but its non-violent character has been completely vindicated by the Brothers' apology, and the case therefore greatly strengthened. *

* Mr. Gandhi again wrote in *Young India* of June 22, 1921:—

An Ounce of Action.—Remarks in the *Servant of India* on the apology of the Ali Brothers, show me more forcibly than anything else the truth of the statement, that an ounce of action is worth more than tons of speeches. I cannot conceive the possibility of the *Servant of India* wilfully misunderstanding or misinterpreting the apology. Yet it has devoted to the apology, three paragraphs which betray a hopeless mis-

What, however, is galling to the writer, is that whilst the Brothers have remained free, the lesser lights are in prison for having spoken less strongly than they.

That very fact shows the real character of non-co-operation. A non-co-operator may not bargain for personal safety. It was open to me to bargain for the liberty of the others. *Then* I would have given away the whole case for non-co-operation. I did not bargain even for the Brothers' liberty. I stated in the clearest possible terms, that no matter what the Government did, it would be my duty on meeting the Brothers to advise them to make the statement to save their honour.

We must 'play the game,' whether the Government reciprocate or not. Indeed, I for one do not *expect* the Government to play the game. It was, when I came to the conclusion that there was no honour about the Government, that I non-co-operated. Lord Reading may wish, does wish to do right and justice. But he

understanding of it. For me it was, and even in the light of the fierce controversy that has raged round it, it remains an object lesson in the practice of non-co-operation. It is the one act, which will stand as a guiding-star to the straying non-co-operators. They must continually purify themselves even in front of their opponents, and at the risk of their action being mistaken for weakness. In the process of putting themselves in the right, they must not count the cost. That is the implication of following truth for truth's sake. The immediate prospect may appear ever so black, a seeker must relentlessly pursue what he knows to be truth. The Prophet would have lost his hold many a time, had he not thus treated truth as his absolute and final sheet-anchor. Assuming that I gave my advice to the Ah Brothers out of my strength, and they understood and accepted it in their strength, the apology will be found to have done as I know it has done, good to the cause of Islam and the country. If, therefore, the last issue of *Young India* has not answered all doubts, I must leave it to time to answer them.

will not be permitted to. If the Government were honourable, they would have set free all the prisoners, as soon as they decided not to presecute the Ali Brothers. If the Government were honourable, they would not have caught youths and put them in prison whilst they left Pandit Motilal Nehru, the arch-offender, free. If the Government were honourable, they would not countenance bogus Leagues of Peace. If the Government were honourable, they would long ago have repented for their heinous deeds, even as we have for every crime committed by our people in Amritsar, Kasur, Virmangaun, Ahmedabad, and recently in Malegaon. I entertain no false hopes or misgivings about the Government. If the Government were to-morrow to arrest the Ali Brothers, I would still justify the apology. They have acted in the square, and we must all do likewise. Indeed inasmuch as the Government are still arresting people for disaffection, they are arresting the Ali Brothers.

The writer is again not taking a correct view of non-co-operation in thinking that non-co-operators who are in gaol, are less fortunate than we who are outside. For me, solitary confinement in a prison cell without any breach on my part of the code of non-co-operation or private or public morals will be freedom. For me the whole of India is a prison, even as a master's house is to his slave. A slave to be free must continuously rise against his slavery and be locked up in his master's cell for his rebellion. The cell-door is the door to freedom. I feel no pity for those who are suffering hardships in the gaols of the Government. Innocence under an evil Government must ever rejoice on the scaffold. It was the easiest thing

for the Brothers to have rejected my advice, and embraced the opportunity of joining their comrades in the gaols. I may inform the reader, that when during the last stage of the South African struggle, I was arrested, my wife and all friends heaved a sigh of relief. It was in the prisons of South Africa that I had leisure and peace from strife and struggle.

It is perhaps now clear, why we non-co-operation prisoners may not make any statement to *gain their freedom*.*

*Mr. Gandhi further wrote on this in *Young India* of June 29, 1921,—

The Apology Again —Nothing has caused so much waste of time as the Simla interview and the apology. From among the many letters before me, I wish to deal with only one. A respected friend, who is jealous of my reputation for honesty and fair play, tells me that the talk in Simla is that I have been unfair to the Viceroy, that I have almost accused him of breach of honour and that I have possibly and unconsciously swerved from the truth in saying that the apology is not made to Government. I still hold that the apology was not tendered to the Government. If it was, I would not have hesitated to make it clear in the wording itself. It was meant not to be ambiguous. There was no occasion for concealing anything for saving the face of the Ali Brothers. I hasten to assure everyone, not excluding His Excellency, that, if I find that I have strayed a hair's breadth, I shall apologise to him and to the world. I hold truth above my influence in my country or anywhere else. I am not conscious of having accused Lord Reading of breach of honour. A rapid conversation is a mental cinematograph. The mind takes in the word pictures as fast as they come, but it does not retain them all fully or in their exact order in memory. It is possible that we both have carried different impressions of the various interviews. I have given mine with the utmost accuracy and as much as I could, without being guilty of a breach of confidence. But I see quite clearly that the public is befogged. It will not be satisfied without a fairly full report of the interviews. I am anxious to satisfy its curiosity. To that end I have already entered into correspondence with H. E. the Viceroy and asked that either an agreed version may be published or I may be absolved from the promise of confidence. So far as I am concerned I have no confidences to be respected.

MR. PAL AGAIN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 15, 1921.)

Mr. Pal's letter to the *Englishman* reproduced in the Press,* requires a full reply. Mr. Pal has evidently been misinformed about many things, and has therefore been tempted to make suggestions, which he would not have, if he had been better informed.

The Government communique, the Viceroy's speech and press reporters' imaginative descriptions of the Simla visit are responsible for the grave misapprehension that has taken place about the visit and the Ali Brothers.

When I went to Simla, I had no notion that I would wait on His Excellency. I knew, that both Pandit Malaviyaji and Mr. Andrews were anxious that I should meet Lord Reading. But I went to Simla only to meet

But I recognise the position of a Viceroy is totally different from that of a public worker like myself. I must ask those who are eager to know the whole story to be a little patient, meanwhile I wish to acknowledge one serious mistake, I see, I have made. I ought to have asked to be shown the communique that was to be issued. I was anxious not to go back to Simla and further interrupt my tour, and I was so certain that everything would pass off nicely and creditably to both parties. With all experience of honest misunderstandings and worse, I should have done better. But that was not to be. I am, however, quite certain that although it is unfortunate that a great deal of bitterness has been generated by the controversy, the country's cause will be found to have gained rather than suffered. Meanwhile I must accept the verdict of the good Maulana Abdal Bari, that the harm in the shape of the drooping of the spirits of non-cooperators is apparent, the gain is in the womb of the future. Let us watch and wait.

* Not included in this collection.

Pandit Malaviyaji, who was too weak to overtake me in my journeyings. It was after hearing Panditji that I decided to write to the Secretary or to the Viceroy, that if His Excellency wished to hear my views about the struggle, I would gladly wait on him. I waited on him, not for the sake of securing a reversal of the decision to arrest the Ali Brothers, but to tell the Viceroy why I had become a non-co-operator. The first and the longest interview did not turn upon the then impending prosecution of the Brothers at all. The question of the Ali brothers came up quite in the natural course, and arose out of our discussion of non-violence and how far it was carried out in practice. When His Excellency showed me some of the extracts from the speeches, I recognised that they were capable of bearing the interpretation sought to be put upon them. I therefore told His Excellency, that as soon as I met them, I would advise the Brothers to make a clearing statement, irrespective of what the Government may do regarding their prosecution. The statement was not conditional upon a revision of the Government's decision. That the Government revised the decision on the strength of the statement, was a wise and natural act on their part. I admit that it has given me relief. But I do not believe with Mr. Pal that the arrest of the Brothers would necessarily have led to bloodshed. The Brothers, like me, continue wilfully to break the law of sedition, and therefore court arrest. Sooner or latter, and that during this year if we can carry the country with us, we must bring about a situation, when the Government must arrest us or grant the people's demands. The Brothers' statement

avoids arrest on a false issue, an issue that cannot be defended.

Whilst, therefore, I was anxious to avoid the prosecution of the Brothers on the ground of incitement to violence, I would welcome a prosecution of them and myself for promoting disaffection towards the Government established by law. We all felt that, having known what was taking place, not to make the statement would be to wrong the cause, and to play into the hands of the enemy.

Mr. Pal is right in thinking, that I expect a settlement by discussion and compromise in matters not of vital interest. But I did not discuss the terms of settlement with the Viceroy. It is for the accredited representatives of the people to do so. There is no fear, I assure Mr. Pal, of my arriving at any settlement over the heads of the people. Nor will there be any confidence when, if ever, the terms of a settlement are discussed. Confidence there must be, when no strangers meet for a friendly intercourse and wish to know each other. We only met to know each others. I wish, however, at once to ease the mind of the reader by telling him, that as an outcome of the interview he need not expect any settlement at an early date, if only because the people have not yet sufficiently prepared themselves for it; and the Viceroy appears to me to be anxious to reconcile the irreconcilable. He cannot pour new wines into old bottles. He cannot keep the Khilafat and the Punjab sores open, and still make India happy and contented.

Mr. Pal is quite right, when he says that if the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs are redressed, I

should leave it to the other leaders to carry on the agitation about Swaraj; for the simple reason that when India has made her power sufficiently felt in connection with the two great questions, she can have Swaraj for the asking. Swaraj is not for me something apart from the people's power to right every wrong, to prevent Dwyerism and Lloyd Georgism. The cult of Sir Michael O'Dyer stands for terrorism, and that of Mr. Lloyd George for treachery. When we have dealt with these two demons, I suggest to Mr. Pal that we are ready to govern ourselves. If my followers in Bengal do not resent my interview with the Viceroy, they know that for me, there is no settlement without a settlement of the two wrongs, they know that time for discussing Swaraj schemes will come, only after the two obstacles to any scheme of settlement are removed. Without their removal, there is nothing for India save complete independence. The Bengalis, who attended the Barisal conference, resented Mr. Pal's discussion because as I apprehend, they considered it to be premature and calculated to interfere with the evolution of the proper Swaraj spirit. Mr. Pal's performance was like that of a mason trying to tackle the top-most storey before the foundation was solidly laid. I would humbly urge Mr. Pal not to land the country in an untimely discussion of Swaraj schemes, and ask him to accept my assurance, that so far as I am concerned, I would not do a single thing about any Swaraj scheme without an open consultation with the representatives of the people. There is no question of consultation about the Khilafat and the Punjab, because the minimum terms are fairly well understood.

THE AGREED STATEMENT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 4, 1921.)

His Excellency the Viceroy has now issued a statement agreed between him and me regarding the interviews I had the honour of having with him. The statement sets forth all the details that the public need know. I do not propose to discuss it. In my opinion it makes it clear that the apology as I have called the statement of regrets initiated with me, that it was conceived before I ever knew of the impending prosecution for the speeches that were shown to me and that it was neither suggested nor made for fear of the prosecution of the Brothers, certainly not to avoid imprisonment. It is my firm belief that the Brothers have rendered a great service to the cause by making the statement. I do not regret having given them the advice. I wish also to place on record my appreciation of the willingness with which Lord Reading approached my request for the publication of an agreed statement. In the lengthy correspondence that ensued between us for settling the form and the language of the statement, I did not observe on His Excellency's part any inclination to avoid mention of any relevant detail. On my part I had informed him that I had no intention to hide any thing whatsoever. The public therefore have a full statement from both sides.

THE AGREED STATEMENT

His Excellency's attention has been directed, and notably by Mr. Gandhi, to various statements that have

appeared, and to inferences that have been drawn in the public Press, relating to the conversations between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi, concerning Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali, which in some respects do not correctly represent the purport of those communications.

The interviews between the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi resulted from a conversation between the Viceroy and Pandit Malaviya, relating to the conditions generally prevailing in India. His Excellency informed Pandit Malaviya of the Government's decision to commence criminal proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali for having made speeches inciting to violence and the discussion turned upon the disturbances that might possibly ensue. Pandit Malaviya expressed the opinion that it would be of advantage for His Excellency to meet Mr. Gandhi. His Excellency replied that he would be glad to meet Mr. Gandhi and hear his views, if he applied for an interview. On the next day, Mr. Andrews saw His Excellency and suggested that he should see Mr. Gandhi. It should be observed that various important matters were discussed during these conversations and that the proposed interview between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi was intended to have reference to the situation generally. His Excellency is, however, aware that Pandit Malaviya, in inviting Mr. Gandhi to Simla, did not refer to the contemplated proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali.

In due course Mr. Gandhi came to Simla, at the request of Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Andrews, and asked for an interview, with His Excellency, which was immediately arranged. At the first interview, no mention was made of the proposed prosecutions. The conversation related

to the causes of discontent in India. Upon the next occasion, His Excellency stated that, according to the Government reports responsible non-co-operators had made speeches inciting to violence, contrary to the doctrine advocated by Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi repudiated incitements to violence on the part of any of the responsible non-co-operators and said that, if he was satisfied that any of them had incited to violence, he would publicly repudiate them and their teachings, unless they withdrew their statements that amounted to incitement to violence. His Excellency mentioned the names of the Ali brothers and promised to show Mr. Gandhi passages in their speeches which, in his opinion, were calculated to incite to violence, and when the passages were actually read to Mr. Gandhi he admitted that they were capable of bearing the interpretation His Excellency put upon them. He, however, asserted that he was convinced that it was not intended by Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali to incite the audience to violence. Mr. Gandhi added that he would see them as soon as he left Simla and advise them to express publicly their regret for the unintentional incitement, contained in the passages. His Excellency, thereupon, asked whether, in view of the importance of the document, Mr. Gandhi would show him the draft of the statement he intended to advise Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali to publish.

It was at this stage the Viceroy said that it was proposed to institute criminal proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali in respect of these passages and that if Mr. Gandhi showed

him the statement and it satisfied him from the standpoint of his Government, he would use his influence, to prevent the institution of prosecution, for, the Viceroy said, the object of the Government would be attained if the making of speeches of a violent character was in future prevented. Mr. Gandhi readily agreed to show the statement. The draft statement was duly shown by Mr. Gandhi to His Excellency, who pointed out that the introduction of certain paragraphs gave the statement the appearance of a manifesto, including that of the religious creed of Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali. The Viceroy observed further that the statement was incomplete so far as it did not contain a promise to refrain in the future from speeches inciting to violence and added that after publication of the statement Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali could give any explanation by means of speeches, provided they did not infringe the law. Mr. Gandhi agreed to delete the paragraphs in question and to add a passage to cover promises of future conduct. His Excellency then informed Mr. Gandhi that if Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali signed the statement as then altered by Mr. Gandhi, with the addition of the promise as to the future conduct steps would be taken to suspend the institution of proceedings and that no prosecution would take place so long as the promises given in the published statement were observed. The Government remained free to take up prosecutions for the past speeches. The Viceroy added that on the event of the publication of the statement by Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali and of the Government refraining in consequence from the pro-

secutions, it would be necessary to issue a *communiqué* explaining the attitude of the Government. There was, however, no desire to bargain. Mr. Gandhi even said that whether the prosecutions took place or not, he would be bound, after having shown the extracts to his friends for their own honour and that of the cause to advise them to express publicly their regret.

During the whole discussion, His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi were actuated by the desire to prevent any untoward events that might result from the prosecutions, as also to prevent speeches inciting to violence. The Viceroy informed Mr. Gandhi that he might not be able to prevent the commencement of proceedings, if the statement was not published with the least possible delay. There was already much discussion of the speeches not only in India, but also in the United Kingdom. Mr. Gandhi agreed that the statement should be published without delay. Mr. Gandhi then left Simla and some days afterwards telegraphed to His Excellency that Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali had signed the statement with immaterial alteration and sent it to the Press for publication. The alteration was as follows: For the passage in Mr. Gandhi's draft statement, "We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence, but we recognise that certain passages in our speeches are capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them," Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali put, "We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence, and we never imagined that any passages in our speeches were capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them, but we recognise the force of our friends' argument and interpretation."

After the publication of the statement, an official *communiqué* was issued by the Government. The terms of the *communiqué* were not actually settled until just before its issue and Mr. Gandhi never saw it although the substance of it, as already indicated, had been communicated to him. The main part of the interviews between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi consisted of conversations which ranged over the various causes of discontent in India, including the Punjab disturbances, the Khilafat agitation, the Treaty of Sevres and the general condition of the people. Mr. Gandhi did not submit any scheme of Swaraj to His Excellency, nor was a scheme of Swaraj discussed at the interviews.

OUR BURDEN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 1, 1920.)

Pir Mehbubshah has fallen. He was a brave man. I am not concerned with his guilt or innocence. If he used the language attributed to him, it certainly constituted an incitement to violence. In that case the punishment of two years simple imprisonment awarded to him was certainly light. Not even the highest in the land, whether belonging to the official class or to the people, can be exempt from punishment for proved guilt. What however commanded my admiration was the fortitude with which the Pir Saheb decided to refrain from offering any defence and patiently to bear the penalty imposed upon him by a lawfully appointed tribunal. I

thought that he had understood the spirit of the struggle. The manner in which his followers seemed to have borne the imprisonment of their leader was also most satisfactory.

But the latter news to the effect that the Pīr Saheb secured his release by an apology shows our weakness. Having been brought up in debilitating atmosphere of servility, the tallest of us often bend before a very simple storm * The temptations of western civilisation, without its hard discipline which the nations of the west undergo, has made us almost incapable of suffering the

* Mr Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of June 1, 1921, —

Unacceptable—Some newspapers, mistaking the apology of the Ali Brothers as of weak men seeking to avoid the discomfort of the prison life, have suggested that the Government should take similar undertakings from those undergoing imprisonment for political offences, and discharge them. No non-co-operator worthy of his creed can possibly purchase his discharge by giving any undertaking to the Government. Every one of them has probably protested his innocence of violent intent. The Ali Brothers, had they been prosecuted, would still have made the statement now made. That would not have prevented their imprisonment. The makers of the unacceptable suggestion even know, that many have been sentenced for disaffection, or for refusing to give security that they will not speak. It is the duty of a non-co-operator to preach disaffection to the existing system of government, to prepare the country for *civil* disobedience, to refuse to give security of the kind just referred to. The Ali Brothers have given no undertaking to refrain from any of the first two things. If, therefore, the Government desire to punish only incitement to violence, almost all the men recently imprisoned are entitled to be discharged without any undertaking on their part. So far as non-co-operators are concerned, they are or ought to be totally indifferent. Prison life must be the normal life of the majority of them. And it delights me to read the names of the people, who cheerfully prefer imprisonment to giving undertakings to buy their freedom. When every care is taken to avoid a breach of his faith, a non-co-operator may not give any pledge of any kind whatsoever to anybody.

physical discomfort entitled by even simple imprisonment. But Pír Mehbubshah's surrender need not dishearten us. When a number of horses are carrying a burden and one becomes fatigued or otherwise incapacitated, the rest if they are spirited animals take up their companion's burden. Put forth greater effort and pull up the load. How much more should we intelligent human beings bear our comrade's burden when he gives in?

Let us therefore see what that burden exactly means. He is an indifferent soldier who ignores his opponent's strength. We must therefore know the strength of the Government with which we are engaged in a fierce struggle. The Government represents a corporation that is crafty in the main godless, untruthful, but courageous, able, self-sacrificing and possessing great powers of organisation. We must therefore meet its craftiness by simplicity and openness, godlessness by godliness, untruthfulness by truthfulness. We must match its courage with greater ability, sacrifice with greater self-sacrifice, and its organising powers with greater organising powers. It has almost matchless weapons of violence. We must meet them with non-violence. Unless we are able to satisfy the test, we must be content to occupy a status of servility. Non-co-operation affords the nation an opportunity of showing all the qualities required for sustaining its honour.

NOBLE REPENTANCE AND ITS LESSON

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1921.)

I have just received the following pathetic letter from Mr. Yakub Hasan :

“I now realize that I have committed a serious indiscretion in a moment of weakness. Ever since the significance of my folly has dawned on me, I am suffering excruciating pain in my heart which is nearly driving me mad. I owe an apology to you as the head of the movement, and I offer it in the most humiliating manner possible. As my guide and leader, scold and chastise me as much as I deserve, but I hope you would for God's sake forgive me my sin. I would undergo a penance to make my peace with God and to undo any disservice that my action may have done to the holy cause that I sincerely and earnestly endeavoured to serve before this according to my lights.”

The letter has a ring of sincerity about it which disarms all criticism. I have informed Mr. Yakub Hasan it is not for me to forgive him. Who knows that I should not prove as weak as he has in the face of danger? God alone can forgive. For He alone knows us through and through. We have His promise through His word revealed in many lands and to many peoples that when a man confesses before Him his weakness with a pure and humble heart, He forgives. Being weak ourselves let us not throw a stone at a brother who has confessed his weakness.

But let Mr. Yakub Hasan's plight serve all of us as a danger signal. For though victory seems to be in sight, there is danger of our not being able to stand the last heat when it comes, as it must. Let us make up our minds, that this Government will drive us through and through, before it really bends to the will of the people. We must be prepared in our thousands to fill the jails of India. We must be prepared not to mind cholera breaking out within their precincts. It is far more sufferable than the moral chronic cholera of slavery we are suffering from. Brave Sherwani has gone to jail without a fault, if the report of the farcical trial be true. Some one or other is daily going to gaol in the United Provinces. Now comes a telegram from the Andhra Province to the effect that two important workers have been sentenced to one year's imprisonment at Guntur—one is a Barrister. Mr. Venkatappaya, who sends the wire, says that more repression is expected. It was bound to come sooner or later. If we stand the fire without flinching, Swarajya this year is a certainty,

But there is danger not only of weakness. There is danger too of people losing their heads under provocation and retorting. This danger of people going mad is more serious than inability or unwillingness to suffer. It is up to every worker throughout India that he prevents violence even at the risk of losing his life in the attempt.

The best answer that India can give to the impending universal repression is to perform the act of renunciation of all foreign cloth in utter disregard of the figures flung in our faces by wise economists. If we have the will, we can manufacture in three months' time all the cloth we

need through hand-spinning and hand-weaving. Have we the will to be satisfied, pending attainment of Swaraj, with Khadi ?

FISHING FOR APOLOGIES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 28, 1921.)

The correspondence published in the *Independent* * between Messrs. Jawahirlal Nehru, Joseph and Ranga Iyer and the U. P. Government proves, that my visit to the Viceroy and my advice to the Al. Brothers to apologise for some of their speeches was a blunder from a political standpoint. It is becoming more and more clear, that as Maulana Abdul Bari has said, whilst the harm done by the visit and the apology is patent, the good that they might have done is too latent to be seen by the public. Happily I am not a politician. And I see the good hidden behind the discreditable use the U.P. Government have made of the Brothers' apology, to lead Messrs. Jawahirlal Nehru and his friends into a trap. The Government have even copied the phraseology of the Brother's apology. Dirt is popularly and correctly described as matter misplaced. In precisely the same manner, whilst I hold that the Brothers' apology was an honourable transaction the apology required by the U. P. Government would have been a dishonourable transaction being out of its place. But that Government had tough people to deal with.

* Not included in the collection.

They were not to be duped by false analogies, nor frightened by threats of imprisonment. The Government therefore has before it the choice of further proving its incapacity and intolerance by launching prosecutions against the three public workers for speeches or writings which the public and themselves had long forgotten. If it prosecutes the offenders, it will prove itself incapable of dealing with the root cause of the unrest, and it will prove itself intolerant of well merited hostile criticism. To call a spade a spade may seem harsh to the spade, but the simple truth is more likely than anything else to go home. A Government that does harsh things cannot be truthfully described by sweet words. The publication of the correspondence therefore has been a great service to the cause of Swaraj. It has cleared the atmosphere, and it serves as guidance for all who are placed in the same position as the three friends. A non-co-operator may not give an apology or undertaking to purchase freedom from prosecution. He must at the same time, whenever his attention is drawn to anything said by him which is calculated to incite to violence, immediately correct his error and keep himself true to his creed. If the Government wish honestly to deal with non-co-operators and wish to imprison them because they do not like non-co-operation even though it is and remains non-violent, it has only to charge them under Section 124A, and every one of us must plead guilty, because it is our creed to harbour and to promote disaffection towards the Government as a system. We are out to destroy the system, and that, I am told, amounts to sedition in terms of that section. If it is permissible in law to compass

destruction of the existing system, every non-co-operator is a pledged loyalist.

FROM RIDICULE. TO——?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 20, 1920.)

It will be admitted that non-co-operation has passed the stage of ridicule.* Whether it will now be met by repression or respect remains to be seen. Opinion has already been expressed in these columns that ridicule is an approved and civilized method of opposition. The Viceregal ridicule though expressed in unnecessarily impolite terms was not open to exception.

But the testing time has now arrived. In a civilized country when ridicule fails to kill a movement, it begins to command respect. Opponents meet it by respectful and cogent argument and the mutual behaviour of rival parties never becomes violent. Each party seeks to convert the other or draw the uncertain element towards its side by pure argument and reasoning.

There is little doubt now that the boycott of the councils will be extensive if it is not complete. The students have become disturbed. Important institutions may any day become truly national. Pandit Motilal Nehru's great renunciation of a legal practice which was probably second to nobody's is by itself an event calculated to change ridicule into respect. It ought to set people

* As to the stage of ridicule see page 360, article entitled 'Ridicule Replacing Repression.'

thinking seriously about their own attitude. There must be something very wrong about our government to warrant the step Pundit Motilal Nehru has taken. Post-graduate students have given up their fellowships. Medical students have refused to appear for their final examination. Non-co-operation in these circumstances cannot be called an insane movement.

Either the Government must bend to the will of the people which is being expressed in no unmistakable terms through non-co-operation, or it must attempt to crush the movement by repression.

Any force used by a government under any circumstance is not repression. An open trial of a person accused of having advocated methods of violence is not repression. Every State has the right to put down violence by force, But the trial of Mr. Zafar Ali Khan and two Moulvis of Panipat shows that the Government is seeking not to put down or prevent violence but to suppress expression of opinion, to prevent spread of disaffection. This is repression. The trials are the beginning of it. It has not still assumed a virulent form but if these trials do not result in stifling the propaganda, it is highly likely that severe repression will be resorted to by the government.

The only other way to prevent the spread of disaffection is to remove the causes thereof. And that would be to respect the growing response of the country to the programme of non-co-operation. It is too much to expect repentance and humility from a government intoxicated with success and power.

We must therefore assume that the second stage in

the Government programme will be repression growing in violence in the same ratio as the progress of Non-co-operation. And if the movement survives repression, the day of victory of truth is near. We must then be prepared for prosecutions, punishments, even up to deportations. We must evolve the capacity for going on with our programme without the leaders. That means capacity for self-government. And as no government in the world can possibly put a whole nation in prison, it must yield to its demand or abdicate in favour of a government suited to that nation.

It is clear that abstention from violence and persistence in the programme are our only and surest chance of attaining our end.

The government has its choice, either to respect the movement or to try to press it by barbarous methods. Our choice is either to succumb to repression or to continue in spite of repression.

THE VICEROY'S TWO SPEECHES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 9, 1921.*)

HIS Excellency the Viceroy has made two important declarations, one on the Khilafat and the other on non-co-operation and the policy of the Government arising from it. On the Khilafat His Excellency has given an exact indication of the Government mentality. He thinks that he has discharged his responsibility fully towards the Muslims of India by pressing their claim

Whereas, the Indian contention is that, on a matter so vital to the Muslims, he should have resigned when he found that the Imperial Government had disallowed the Indian claim. Nobody accepts the plea of Britain's helplessness at the Council table of the League of Nations. The public may also recall the fact that, when the terms of the treaty of Sevres were published, the Viceroy entered upon an elaborate defence of the part played by the Premier. How comes it then, that he finds himself, again, pleading the Muslim cause! Would he have done so if there had been no non-co-operation? And what has he to say even now? If the claim is disallowed and non-co-operation is still pursued, he assumes anarchy will be the result. Therefore, the Government, he threatens, will setp in to restore order. We know what "restoring" order means. His Excellency forgets that, if there is anarchy in India, it would be due to the criminal breach of their duty, both by the Imperial and the Indian Governments, towards the three hundred millions of the people of India.

A Viceroy may be satisfied with merely pleading the case of India. Can India be satisfied? Can a man who is dying of hunger be satisfied with mere sympathy, especially, when he knows that the sympathiser can give more than mere sympathy? When the Indian Government pleads the duty of subordination to an immoral superior power, it must share the adverse judgment that may be pronounced against the latter. No duty devolves upon any servant of submitting to orders in breach of trust or honour. The treaty of Sevres is a breach of solemn pledges and the ordinary canons

of honour. One who sincerely sympathises with a starving man is presumed to share such sufferings, and is not expected to shoot him when the latter shows symptoms of becoming mad through the pangs of hunger. The responsibility for anarchy, if it does overtake India, will therefore rest with the Indian Government and with those who support it in spite of its wrongs, not upon those who refuse to perform its wrongs, not upon those who refuse to perform the impossible task of making people forget vital wrongs and try to direct their anger in a proper channel.

His Excellency wonders at the description of the Government as satanic. He is wrong in adopting the description for himself. For nobody has accused individuals of being satanic. His Excellency's adroitly taking in that category his Indian colleagues, is too artless to deceive anyone. But the system that the Viceroy and his colleagues, whether Indian or English, administer, possesses all the attributes of Satan—deceitfulness, hypocrisy, unscrupulousness, and unmitigated tyranny on occasion and its justification tempered by half-hearted confessions. His Excellency may rest assured that there is no partiality in non-co-operation. There is always a place of honour for an Englishman in the ranks of non-co-operationists. And no Indian co-operator will be spared the criticism that may be deserved by him for his complicity in the crimes of an evil Government.

His Excellency is on safest ground when he enunciates the doctrine of meeting non-co-operation by propaganda—by the counter-propaganda of co-operation. He is entitled to take all the comfort he can from the fact that

both the title-holders and the students have made a poor response in point of numbers and that sufficient Indians have been found to act as members of the reformed legislatures. Non-co-operationists, whilst admitting that the numerical response might have been greater, manage, however, to take pleasure in the titles and the schools and the law-courts having fallen into disrepute. These institutions no longer remain the objects of idolatry that they once were. Non-co-operationists are satisfied that practising lawyers and title-holders can no longer be popular leaders. They know that even those, who have not given up titles, practice, or schools, are at heart non-co-operators and confess their weakness.

His Excellency has been misled by his advisers in believing that non-co-operationists have only now turned their attention to the masses. Indeed, they are our sheet-anchor. But we are not going to tamper with them. We shall continue patiently to educate them politically till they are ready for safe action. There need be no mistake about our goal. As soon as we feel reasonably confident of non-violence, continuing among them in spite of provoking executions, we shall certainly call upon the sepoy to lay down his arms and the peasantry to suspend payment of taxes. We are hoping that that time may never have to be reached. We shall leave no stone unturned to avoid such a serious step. But we will not flinch when the moment has come and the need has arisen.

INSANITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 26, 1920.)

In the course of its discussion of my views on non-co-operation, the Allahabad *Leader* asked me to state what I meant by 'wise and temperate action' on the part of the Government in dealing with the Khilafat agitation. The U. P. Government have provided me with an excellent illustration of unwise and intemperate action almost, if not altogether, amounting to insanity. I refer to the externment from Mussorie, of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the son of the Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Mr. Jewaharlal Nehru's dignified letter to the Superintendent of Police furnishes the public with all the facts in connection with the order served on him. The whole of the Allahabad public could bear witness, if witnesses to the action of an honourable man were necessary, that Mr. Nehru junior was proceeding with his mother, his sisters and his ailing wife to Mussorie purely for reasons of health. Having inquired of him, having received an unequivocal, straightforward and full explanation of his presence in Mussorie, having the knowledge that the members of the family were with him in Mussorie, the authorities ought to have accepted Mr. Nehru's word and refrained from taking further action. It should be remembered that Mr. Nehru in his letter to the Superintendent of Police, said: "I have no concern with the Afghan delegation and it was an accident that we both happened to be in the same hotel. As a matter of fact their presence

here has put me out to a certain extent as I was looking forward to taking possession of the rooms at present occupied by them. I am of course interested in the delegation as every intelligent person must be. But I had or have not the slightest intention of going out of my way to meet them. We have been here now for the last seventeen days and during this period I have not seen a single member of the delegation even from a distance. You are yourself aware of this fact as you told me this morning". This was not enough for the authorities. They had lost their mental balance. They wanted an assurance that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru would not have any communication with the delegation, for we learn from the same letter ; " but although I have no intention whatever of seeing the Afghans or of having any communication with them, I utterly dislike the idea of binding myself down to any course of action at the instance of the Government, even though such action may not prove irksome. It is really a question of principle or conscience. You will, I feel sure, appreciate my position." And the Government whom Mr. Oakes, the Superintendent of Police represented, appreciated the position by serving on him the order of externment two days after the receipt of the letter. Mr. Nehru was anxious that the Government should have the full facts before them, therefore told them in the same letter : " If the Government chooses to serve any order on me, I am for the present prepared to obey it. It will be a great inconvenience to me to go down suddenly and leave my family by themselves here. The condition of my wife's health requires the most careful attention and my mother is a confined invalid and it is most difficult

to leave them uncared for. My sudden departure will upset my father's and my plans entirely and cause us any amount of trouble and anxiety. But I suppose individual conveniences cannot be considered in high matters of State."

In a well-regulated State, individual inconvenience is as much a 'high matter of State' as any other, except when individual welfare demonstrably requires to be sacrificed to corporate welfare. In this instance there is nothing, so far as the public are aware, to warrant the inhumanity of tearing a husband from his ailing wife and separating an aged mother from her only son and protector when they have no one else to look after them and are away from home. I call this insanity of a very severe type and it can only proceed from a guilty conscience. The Government know that the peace terms are dishonourable and in breach of the pledges of ministers. They know too, that the Mahomedan sentiment has been deeply hurt. They know that the Hindu sympathy is completely with them and they know that the Afghan delegation is also in complete accord with the India Mahomedan feeling. They are therefore afraid of any Indian of importance being in the position of knowing anything of or from the Afghan delegation. The Government have therefore become hyper-suspicious.

But we must not answer this madness with madness. I am loath to think that the Government of Sir Harcourt Butler desires to goad the people to violence so that he can repeat the frightfulness of the Punjab and terrorise the people silence and submission. But whether it is the intention of that Government to do so or not, the leaders of the Khilafat movement must prepare themselves for more acts

of the Mussorie type. And the way to success lies not in becoming angry but in welcoming such acts of repression so that they may, ceasing to produce any effect upon those against whom they are directed, cease altogether even as a medicine that does not react upon a patient, is necessarily stopped by the administering physician. The severest punishment is stopped as soon as it fails to produce the effect intended.

But the most shocking instance of madness comes from Sind. The *Alwahid*, published in Karachi in Sindhi and owned by a responsible merchant, has, in its issue of the 13th instant, a letter from the Secretary of the Khilafat Committee, Jacobabad, which after relating that some respectable men connected with the Khilafat movement were sent to jail, proceeds that a respectable Zamindar was whipped by the Deputy Commissioner with closed doors and that on his crying out, the Police entered the room and administered further beating to him. In Mussorie, at least, the decorum of law, such as it is, was observed. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru was not physically molested. But in Sind, if the allegation of the Secretary of the Khilafat Committee is true, a respectable man has been whipped by a Deputy Commissioner, so far as the public are aware, without any cause whatsoever warranting such procedure. The Governor of Bombay enjoys the reputation of being the sanest of Governors and one may trust that he will make the fullest enquiry into the incident and the other allegations made, and publish the result of that enquiry. The *Bombay Chronicle* supports the *Alwahid* statement by giving the version of the same incident received by Mr. Shaukat Ali. If the facts set forth are true the

offending Deputy Commissioner must be removed. But whether he is removed or not, the duty before those who are guiding the Khilafat movement is absolutely clear. Are they prepared to go through the fieriest of ordeals? An insolent treaty of peace if it is in any way resisted by those who are affected by it, can only be supported by an equally insolent exhibition of force. And if Indian Mahomedans and Indians in general are more concerned with the revision of the treaty than with showing resentment and anger, they will submit to all the ill-treatment that may be meted out to them and yet pursue the policy of not submitting to the treaty. Any use of violence against Government violence must kill the Khilafat movement.

REPRESSION IN THE PUNJAB

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 29, 1920.)

Mr. Zafar Ali Khan, the editor and proprietor of the *Zamindar* of Lahore, is on his trial. Probably by the time this appears in print, his fate will have been decided. The reader will see the charge sheet against Mr. Zafar Ali Khan. It is worth studying from the political standpoint. The judicial must for the time being rest with the judges. He has been accused of having made use of sentiments amounting to an attempt to create disaffection towards the Government established by law in British India and to promote feelings of enmity between different classes of His Majesty's subjects.

The statements attributed to Mr. Z. A. Khan undoubtedly constitute the crime, if they were actually made and are not true. For to state facts cannot by any stretch of the canon of interpretation amount to an attempt to excite disaffection or promote enmity. To speak of General Dyer's performances, of Mr. Lloyd George's breach of promises or of the Viceroy's and Mr. Montagu's defence of O'Dwyerism, would be to speak the truth; and yet it cannot but excite disaffection towards a Government that is guilty of condonation of crimes or breaches of deliberate pledges. And if it be a crime to speak the truth, it is a virtue and a duty to promote disaffection. Similarly if the telling of truth promotes feelings of enmity between classes, it has to be risked if truth may not be sacrificed. Suppression of material but damaging facts cannot promote friendship but can only make the enmity more deadly for its secrecy.

In Mr. Zafar Ali Khan's case there are two statements which are, so far as I am aware, unsupportable by evidence. Mecca was never set on fire. And there seems to be no warrant for the statement that virgin girls were outraged in Baghdad. I do not know whether Mr. Zafer Ali Khan made the two statements imputed to him. I should be sorry if he did. Khilafat workers in particular, and all other workers in general, cannot be too strongly urged to avoid all exaggeration. Facts are always stronger than fiction. The latter hurts a cause in the long run and discredits the speaker. The case against the Government based on proved facts is invulnerably strong. And public movements will gain greatly when no charge of exaggeration can be sustained against workers.

But the charges that will be and must be admitted by Mr. Khan are really from the Government's point of view far more serious, and yet of those charges I am guilty equally with Mr. Khan. For instance, the conditions laid down for a hearty reception to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales would be mine as they are stated to be Mr. Khan's. It is but too true, if the conditions laid down are not fulfilled, that this Empire must perish.

Hitherto the Government has taken no notice of speeches advising non-co-operation and containing such demands as are said to have been made or advice as is said to have been given by Mr. Zafar Ali Khan. And I had begun to think that the Government were adopting the healthy method of allowing such agitation to go on so long as it did not result in violence. I had thought that the Government had ceased to think of punishing a man for expressing his views however extreme they might be so long as they did not incite the people to violence.

But the policy is evidently to be changed. Mr. Zafar Ali Khan's speech must have told. He preached against recruiting in the District which provided recruits. And if such preaching is wrong, the Congress itself has done wrong. Yet surely it is the right of a citizen to warn people against accepting an occupation that is harmful to the people's self-respect or religious honour.

Mr. Habib Shah of *Siasat* had his security forfeited, I suppose, for much the same reasons. This kind of repression we must expect as non-co-operation begins to produce its effect. It is clear that success depends entirely upon our ability to carry on our campaign in spite of repression by way of prosecution of speakers and sup-

pression of newspapers. Such repression must simply nerve us for further effort. And the demands must be repeated not by one man but thousands. Newspaper-men need not feel concerned if their activity is stopped. Door to door propaganda, circulars written by the hand and multiplied after the snow-ball process by voluntary workers will result in more concentrated work than newspapers. When the struggle reaches the effective stage even in spite of peace reigning in the land, we must be prepared for prosecutions and internments and the like. And the victory will be ours, only when the struggle survives the repressive stage and makes non-co-operation more popular than ever. For will it not be a conclusive proof of the necessity of non-co-operation with a Government that will suppress even the legitimate aspirations of the people and a legitimate and truthful narrative of facts, however distasteful they may be to the Government.

Only we dare not be impatient. Sentences like the following do betray impatience. "I have heard that in Baghdad a father and son were in the Indian army. They were fighting against the Turks. The son was killed in action, the father carried his body to Baghdad. In the way he noticed that his son's face had turned into that of a pig!" These sentences have been put into Mr. Khan's mouth. It is an appeal to superstition. I hope that Mr. Zafar Ali Khan did not appeal to the superstition of his audience. The Khilafat agitation is a religious movement. It must be free from untruth, exaggeration, violence of speech or action, and superstition or prejudice. The cause itself is truthful, and truth,

when self-sacrifice and courage have been applied for its vindication, has never yet been known to fail.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1920.)

I have seen the repudiation by the Punjab Government of a statement made at a public meeting in Lahore that Maulana Zafar Ali Khan was reported by his son to be confined in a dark small room and that, although he was an under-trial prisoner, he was given only prison food. The Government communique does not mention the name of the speaker at the meeting in question. I must confess that I was the speaker, and I made the statements now contradicted by the Government. I was careful. I stated the source of my information and said that if it was true, the treatment was illegal and inhuman. I am glad that the Government have repudiated all the three statements. I could have no desire further to discredit the already discredited Government of the Punjab by a single exaggerated statement, I know that the cause of India can only suffer by a single wrong statement. At the same time I must be forgiven for looking with suspicion upon all Government contradictions. I have had more than enough experience of such contradictions during the dark days in the Punjab. The majority of these contradictions were simply lies. I therefore ask the reader to reserve his opinion till Maulana

Zafar Ali's son has given his explanation. He gave me the information with great deliberation and I have, and had, no reason to doubt the accuracy of his statement. I am in communication with him.

Meanwhile let the reader join me in congratulating Maulana Zafar Ali Khan in receiving his sentence of five years' transportation and Rs. 1,000 fine. Let the reader realise that he has had this sentence for holding opinions. I have already analysed the indictment in these pages. Thus has repression begun in the Punjab. There is also the seditious meetings prohibition. The strong speeches are strong if calling a spade a spade be strong—if a demand for full independence, in case the Government do not repent, be strong.

Only, this repression need not worry us. It should strengthen our resolve to throw off a yoke which is intended to humiliate us and keep us in perpetual servility. The one indispensable condition of success is that we must not on any account lose our heads in the midst of repression. We must not retaliate secretly or openly. We must bear the repression meekly and use it to strengthen our resolve to suspend or sever all association with the Government. To observe *Hartal* when an innocent man is imprisoned betrays weakness—a desire not to go to gaol. But I see no gateway to liberty save the doors of His Majesty's prison. And when a single political offender is imprisoned for no fault save an expression of his opinion, we must rejoice in his suffering. The best way of emptying the gaols of political offenders is to fill them. And the best way to fill them is ceaselessly to go on enforcing non-co-operation and unhesitatingly and

unequivocally to demand full *Swaraj* with the British connection if possible, and even without if necessary.

If the Punjab Government have been active in repressing expression of opinion, the U. P. Government have been no less so. Maulana Zafar-ul Mulk has been sentenced to two year's imprisonment and Rs. 750 fine, or nine months more if he fails to pay the fine. More arrests are promised. On the top of this comes the suggestion that my activities must not be left unchecked, My activities must result in the attainment of *Swaraj* within a short time, and if *Swaraj* must be delayed, the people must be debarred from hearing or adopting my views. The Government have the right to take away my liberty so long as in their opinion my activities are harmful. It will undoubtedly be more honourable to deal with me than with my co-workers. They cannot distinguish between my activity and that of my co-workers. Both are absolutely peaceful. We are concerned merely in spreading a certain class of opinions which if carried out can never result in violence. And only a tyrannical government endeavours to suppress non-violent propaganda. So long therefore as this Government of ours persists in its denial of justice to the Khilafat and the Punjab, so long must it resort to repression—the only means available to a tyrant when he is thwarted in his purpose.

(December 1, 1920.)

I promised to inquire of Maulana Zafar Ali Khan's son about the accuracy of the statement he made to me regarding the treatment of his father in the Lahore gaol pending trial. I have now heard from him and he has

no hesitation in calling the local government *communiqué* 'a lie.' He says that the information he gave me was absolutely correct, that Maulana Zafar Ali Khan was kept in a dark room, and that he was not permitted to receive food from outside. The son however adds that, after the public declaration made at the Lahore meeting his father was removed to better quarters and permitted to receive food from outside. This does not improve the government's case but rather makes it worse. Their having corrected the illegality after it was made public, betrays a guilty conscience. They knew that they were in the wrong, but had expected that this gross ill-treatment of an under-trial prisoner would pass unnoticed. There is another possible and charitable explanation. It may be that the higher authorities knew nothing of the illegality, that it was the act of an under-official without the knowledge of the higher authorities, and that they have themselves been duped by the guilty official. But if that is so, it is a further proof of the state of corruption that is rampant in the present administration. I hope that Government will cause further inquiries to be made. I have no desire to heap discredit upon it where none is deserved. But till the matter is cleared up, the public will be entitled to believe the statement reaffirmed by the son of Maulana Zafar Ali Khan.

“HOW TO SEE ZAFAR ALI KHAN”

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 24, 1920.)

The following is an English rendering of brief notes of Mr. Gandhi's Lahore speech contributed by Mr. Mahadev Desai to *Navjivan* of the 4th instant :—

Mr. Gandhi referred mainly to the imprisonment of Moulvi Zafar Ali Khan in his speech. He said that the Moulvi had already secured his liberty by going to jail, while we were still slaves. He repeated with special stress the words of the Moulvi that this Empire would collapse, and added that the Government was sure to be uprooted if it did not give us justice in the Punjab and Khilafat matters ; and that it was the duty of all Indians to do their might towards its overthrow, keeping themselves within the paths of truth and justice ; because to destroy this oppressive Government was to obey the word of God.

He further said that ‘there are two ways by which we can see Moulvi Zafar Ali Khan. One is that he should apologise for his words and be acquitted ; but that he will never do. The second is that we should enter the jail. Sikhs, Hindus, Mohamedans, whoever have the strength to do what he did, can secure his acquittal by entering the jail. But those who will request the Government to set him at liberty will thereby commit a national crime. I called the Sikhs brave. They have shed their own blood for the sake of this Government. Other races are brought into submission with their help. It is due to them

that hundreds of Arabs and Egyptians have been cut down. And to-day how are the Sikhs rewarded for all their bravery? Ask that of Sirdar Goharsing of Shikhpur. If the Sikhs would do their duty by their Hindoo and Mohamedan brethren, they would surely bring about the release of Moulvi Zafar Ali Khan and also *Swaraj*.

Mr. Gandhi further said that he was deeply pained by the remark of a *fakir* during the speech of Maulana Mohamad Ali, that so long as material are not ready for the use of the Sword, we can do nothing but harm ourselves by resorting to the sword. He was altogether opposed to the use of the sword and expected that the Maulana would agree with him in the end. Murder of one Englishman would result not in our independence but in thousands of Jallanwallas. Even an encounter with arms would necessitate training and sacrifice. He then dilated upon the necessity of self-control with special stress upon the conquest of the senses, and in conclusion advised the audience to demand justice from the Government in the Punjab and Khilafat matters and failing to receive that, to paralyse the Government by renouncing all connection with it. They should either get Zafar Ali Khan released or enter the jails themselves.

REPRESSION IN BIHAR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 2, 1921.*)

Bihar is a province in which the most solid work is being done in connection with non-co-operation. Its leaders

understand the true spirit of non-violence. They are trying to curb, and are succeeding in curbing, the zeal of those who would cross the boundary line, even in speech. There is no danger of an outbreak of violence in Bihar. The province has splendid record of purifying work. The temperance movement has made such rapid strides that the excise revenue is likely to be very considerably affected. The educational movement is making great progress. Many pleaders have suspended practice. The people are settling their disputes by arbitration. There are signs on every side of a national awakening of which any popular government would have been proud. Not so the Bihar Government. And, yet, people had high hopes of Bihar, for, had it not an Indian Governor, one of the ablest of India's sons, an ex-President of the Congress? Even Lord Sinha has his limitations. He has become part of a machinery which is grinding the people, and his abilities can only be utilised to run that machinery, or he must fall out.

Repression is most rampant in Bihar because the officials have become daring under the cover of an Indian Governor. Lord Sinha has become a shield for official offenders.

Let the reader judge from the following facts. Maulana Mazarul Huq and Babu Rajendraprasad, both well-known in Bihar, were prevented from going to Arrah. A letter from a friend says: "In the Districts of Muzaffarpur, Saran, and Champaran, notices under sections 144 and 107 are being continuously served. Those who decline to be bound over are imprisoned. Thirty such persons have already gone to gaol. Action against others is pending. It is a matter of pleasure that some of these

are old men and that the womenfolk, instead of being downcast over these imprisonments, have felt unconcerned, if not elated."

Maulana Shafi or Babu Ramnand have received the following notice :—

Whereas I am reliably informed and I am satisfied that you intend addressing a public meeting in Hajipur, in which you will exhort your hearers to suffer imprisonment even in the cause of non-co-operation, and will also speak on other matters in connection with non-co-operation which exhortations are likely to cause excitement amongst your hearers and a breach of the public tranquility may reasonably ensue, I therefore, by virtue of the powers vested in me under s 144, C P C., hereby order you to abstain from delivering any speech on non-co-operation in any of its forms within the limits of my jurisdiction.

The Sub-Divisional Officer who has signed the notice claims to have known beforehand what the gentlemen were going to speak! And it was non-co-operation! Speakers all over India have been asking people to prepare themselves for imprisonment. It has caused no breaking of public tranquillity anywhere. All the most popular organisations have preached non-co-operation, and it is being preached daily from a thousand platforms. The terms of the order virtually prevent the speakers from speaking on swadeshi, temperance, untouchability and Hindu-Muslim unity. They are all 'forms' of non-co-operation,

Another order runs as follows :—

Whereas it has been reported to me that Brahmchari Ram Rakhsha of Bangra P S, Gopalganj, Saran, addressed a meeting yesterday in which he denounced the Government and the British people as treacherous pledge-breakers and tyrannical, and stated that the policy of the British Government was to set one race against another in order to rule both, and that the Government is bound to disappear on account of its *Zulum*, and that if all Indians responded to the call of Gandhi they could expel the British Government within ten days and it has further been reported that this speech caused great excitement, and that another such speech is

likely to cause a breach of the peace, and whereas it appears that the said Bramchari Ram Rakhsha intends to make a similar speech again to-day, I hereby forbid him under Sec. 144, Cr. P. C. to abstain from making any speech whatever to any gathering of five or more persons in any part of the Sitamarhi Sub-Division in any open place during a period of one month from the date of this order

Again, what the Brahmachari has been gagged for has been uttered by thousands of lips. The charge brought against the government by the Brahmachari occurs in the preamble of the Special Congress Resolution. I have myself had the honour of denouncing the Government as 'treacherous, pledge-breakers and tyrannical.' It was left to the Magistrate of Sitamarhi to discover that it was a crime to denounce the Government in those terms.

Now the question is : what can Lord Sinha do short of resigning ? He cannot supervise the orders of even magistrates. If he did, the magistrates will non-co-operate, strike, and make his position intolerable and government impossible. Therefore, for the sake of, some day and in some way, serving his country as Governor, he makes himself believe that it is better for him to hold on to his post than make room for an English Governor. This is but the beginning of his rule. The public will find that the Civil Service under his regime will have consolidated its power more thoroughly than under an English Governor. And this, for two reasons ; the Civil Service will make a greater grievance of every restraint under Lord Sinha than they would under an English Governor, and the people would submit to wrongs more cheerfully because they would naturally want to make his regime successful. And thus the strongest Indian who could possibly have been selected for the high post of a Governor

will fail not because of want of effort or ability but because of the inherent evil of the system His Excellency has been called upon to administer. It gives me no pleasure, thus, to have to criticise the rule of one for whom I entertain very high regard. But even a Gokhale would have failed had he been called upon to administer the system with its existing spirit.

REPRESSION GALORE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 2, 1921.*)

I have devoted a special article to the Bihar repression.* Since writing it I have come across more news in the press about Bihar. And if there is no second Jallianwala

* Mr. Gandhi further wrote as follows in *Young India* of March 9, 1921. —

Duty of Non-Co-operationists—Our duty in the face of this repression is clear. We have undertaken to suffer for the sake of Islam, the Punjab and Swaraj. We must therefore welcome these prosecutions and the resulting imprisonments. Every good movement passes through five stages, indifference, ridicule, abuse, repression, and respect. We had indifference for a few months. Then the Viceroy graciously laughed at it. Abuse including misrepresentation has been the order of the day. The provincial Governors and the anti-non-co-operation press have heaped as much abuse upon the movement as they have been able to. Now comes repression, at present yet in its fairly mild form. Every movement that survives repression, mild or severe, invariably commands respect which is another name for success. This repression, if we are true, may be treated as a sure sign of the approaching victory. But, if we are true, we shall be neither cowed down nor angrily retaliate and be violent. *Violence is suicide.* Let us recognise that power dies hard, and that it is but natural for the Government to make a final effort for life even though it be through repression. Complete self-restraint at the present critical moment is the speediest

in Bihar, it will be due, not to want of goading by the authorities, but to the exemplary self-restraint of the Biharis. What is there to prevent an officer from shooting an unsuspecting crowd which he may allege, and believe, to have collected in defiance of an order? Such a thing may easily happen, and the catastrophe may go down to

way to success and the easiest way of blunting the edge of repressive measures is a more extensive boycott of titles, schools, law courts, and foreign cloth and a more intelligent activity for the revival of hand spinning and hand weaving.

Mr Gandhi further wrote on June 29, 1921, —

The Gateway of Freedom.—There are still people even in advanced circles who doubt the efficacy of imprisonment for securing India's freedom. They think that imprisonment deprives the people of the services of brave men. It is as much as to say that the bravest soldiers should not run any risk for fear of their guidance being lost to the cause they espouse. Such sceptics forget that the Lokamanya owed his immense popularity and his influence to his having suffered imprisonment. Jesus' death on the Calvary was his crowning achievement. The passion of Imam Hassan on the field of Karbala made Islam a power in the world. Harishchandra is remembered for his endless sufferings. India cannot attain freedom until lacs upon lacs have become fearless and are ready to seek imprisonment in their innocence. And if lacs are not ready, thousands must be actually imprisoned before India attains freedom. Non-co-operation is intended to evoke the truest bravery of the nation. We must be prepared to defy sufferings even unto death, if we will be free. He who saves himself shall perish.

May We defend.—If it is true that we must fill the gaols of India for the sake of legitimately opposing the will of this government, it follows that we cannot defend ourselves before a British court of law, much less can we engage counsel. I know it is possible to imagine hard cases as, say of the Savarkar brothers. If I knew them to be convinced non-co-operators, I would have no hesitation in advising them to waive any action for damages against their persecutors, even though they may be wholly in the right. Though the abstention in such cases will be due more to the resolution of the boycott of British Courts, it will be equally necessary in terms of the law of suffering.

history, written by a government historian, as an "error of judgment."

Repression is assuming definite shape in the United Provinces also. Public speakers are being restrained.

The Calicut Magistrate has rendered himself famous by imprisoning Mr. Yakoob Hassan and his companions.

But it is the expected that is happening. Swaraj cannot, must not, be cheaply attained. Why should not all, young and old, suffer imprisonment? It is common suffering that will indissolubly bind us together. As non-co-operation begins to tell, the authorities are bound to lose their heads.

For, it is clear, that as yet there is no real desire to repent. The Duke has spoken sonorous sentiments, and it is said that, whilst H. R. H. was pronouncing these sentiments, he was visibly affected. The Council has accepted a resolution recording its regret over what happened during the fateful April of 1919, and, as if to mock us, almost at the time that these empty sentiments were being uttered, the magistrates in various provinces were hatching plots of repression. It was a most telling illustration of what is meant by wordy repentance.

India to-day wants no magnanimous speech nor for that matter, any magnanimous action. What she is thirsting for is the barest justice. She is entitled to demand the stoppage of pensions from the Indian treasury to Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer. She cannot be satisfied so long as officers who have misbehaved are still in the enjoyment of high offices.

But so long as this elementary justice is withheld, so long must India continue the battle of non-co-operation,

and so long must the Government continue its policy of repression.

We must treat repression as the touchstone wherewith we are to be tested. If we can stand it without wincing or without losing self-control, it will do us good and bring us nearer the goal. If we are in earnest we shall go through the ordeal without losing temper. After all,

we are trying the temper of the government by refusing co-operation, but its instinct of self-preservation keeps it sober up to a point. It loses balance after that point is reached. As a rule, we respond by becoming angry in turn and so the Government feels stronger for our weakness. Non-violence teaches us that we make no response to the Government's temper. And, if we carry out the lesson in practice, the Government must lose. Repression will have lost its edge because of our non-response, even as an arm swung in the air becomes dislocated for want of response.

TELEGRAPHIC EMBARGO

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 9, 1921.)

A message was required by my assistant at Ahmedabad regarding the Duke's visit to Bombay. I sent the following wire: 'Bombay should certainly boycott Duke's visit like other cities.' The message was sent on the 18th ultimo. I received the following reply dated the 24th ultimo at the Lahore Telegraph Office: 'Your telegram addressed to Anandanand, Navajivan, Ahmedabad on the

18th has been held up at Ahmedabad as objectionable under rulings of the Department. A refund will be granted on your applying for same. Nobody can seriously object to the prevention of the telegraph line being used for destroying a system in whose interest, chiefly, it is run. Only, the embargo further discredits the system. If one man alone⁴ thought it evil, the embargo would enable the thinker to hang his head on the atrocious limitation of the liberty of the public. In a case like the present, it was very like the attempt to stop with a straw an on-rushing torrent. In either case the prohibition of bonafide propaganda, even though it may be objectionable from the Government's standpoint, must be a useless procedure. The present embargo, however, is symptomatic of a government tottering to its own destruction.

Though I consider this embargo to be an exhibition of mere local overzeal, it has a lesson for us. Any day the Government may prohibit the use of the telegraph, the post, the rail, and the press by non-co-operationists. Will it stop the struggle for a single minute? I hope not. It has been conceived so to be independent of Government sufferance. For it depends for success upon its universality. Non-co-operation by stray individuals is, no doubt, possible and conceivable. It has been to take a somewhat different shape. But when the spirit of it pervades the whole of India, we need not feel dependent upon the telegraph, the post, the rail, or the press. Our work can be done quite effectively without the aid of these agencies. We can send messages from mouth to mouth with electric speed. The railway train quickly transfers leaders from place to place, but it quickly transfers thousands of

curiosity-mongers who serve no purpose and cause national waste. I can contemplate with perfect calmness the prohibition of the use of the rail by all except those who sign the creed of co-operation with the Government—we should have an automatic census of co-operators. So long as we have pen and paper or even slate and pencil, we need not despair of transmitting our thoughts in writing, if we have enough volunteers. I have often been told that the independence of our printing press is a desideratum. I admit that it is a convenience but I was able to show during the Satyagraha week in the April of 1919 that it was possible to issue a written newspaper. Given a sufficient number of volunteer writers, we can multiply copies indefinitely. I can foresee many advantages in non-co-operationists being confined to their pens only.

THE BIHAR GOVERNMENT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 9, 1921.*)

When I wrote about about the Bihar Government last week, I did not know half as much as I do to-day. I rarely get the newspapers during my incessant travels. When I do get some, I find little time to read them. It was only during my visit to Lucknow that I saw the extraordinary circular of the Bihar Government practically inciting the officials to lawlessness. No wonder non-co-operation has become in Bihar almost a statutory crime. No wonder a Bihar magistrate has the impudence to assault an inoffensive *sanyasi* in the presence of a large

crowd of admirers. I do not know that such a non-violent atmosphere was possible a year ago. No wonder such a respectable leader like Mian Mahomed Shafi of Muzuffarpur was prohibited from seeing the *sanyasi* and his position as a Congress Secretary ignored. I am hoping that the Government employees will answer the Bihar Government circular by attending non-co-operation meetings in a body and dare it to dismiss them. One can understand the prohibition against public servants not speaking at such meetings. But to restrain them from attending non-co-operation meetings or contributing funds to national institutions or introducing the spinning wheel, is unpardonable restriction on individual liberty, to which, I trust, the public servants will refuse to be party by complying.

The Behar Government is illustrating the meaning of counter-propaganda by Government referred to in his speech by Lord Chelmsford. This Government has gagged non-co-operationists of unimpeachable character and invited its officials and other supporters to conduct an unopposed campaign against non-co-operation. I understand that overzealous chowkidars announce these Government meetings in my name. The people gather, see unfamiliar faces, and most of them retire. Those who remain to listen to the eloquence of co-operators are told that, if the law-courts are abandoned and the drink shops are closed, the Government revenue will suffer. Thus, these co-operation speakers put a premium on drink and litigation. I have given the substance of a graphic description given to me by a most reliable worker. It is a highly probable picture. A moment's thought

will show that the Government speakers must say what my informant has attributed to them. A non-co-operationist usually begins by describing the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and demonstrating the satanic nature of the system under which we are governed. He ends by asking people to be peaceful, to renounce intoxicants, law-courts, schools, and foreign goods, and to take up the spinning wheel. A thoughtless non-co-operation speaker also abuses co-operators and ignorantly advises their social boycott. A Government speaker must declare the Government as almost angelic in spite of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, and ask the people not to give up law courts because they give justice, and not to give up drink because an occasional draught is no crime, and it brings revenue to the Government and enables it to conduct schools. The spinning wheel, he must contend, is an antediluvian fad impossible to reintroduce in our homes, and foreign goods we cannot do without till India has become educated and industrial to the extent of being able to compete with foreign market. Thus, Government propaganda must at least indirectly encourage drinking, litigation, and use of foreign goods.

An honest Government responsive to the wishes of the people will seize this golden opportunity of allying itself with the people, thus getting rid of the drink curse, will encourage even indifferent experiments in national education as a lesson in self-help, will stimulate the desire for settlement of disputes by arbitration, and will welcome the revival of hand spinning, if only as an aid to machine manufacture and industry in the place of idleness. A Government anxious for public welfare will recognise the

inner meaning of the struggle, will understand its religious nature, and, conscious of its good motive and moral strength, will be indifferent to the opposition against itself and will hail the great undoubted revival of a yearning after strength, character and purity. But that would mean a change of heart on the part of the Government, which need not be expected just yet.

REPRESSION AND ITS LESSON

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 30, 1921.*) -

I had the pleasure, whilst at Nagpur, of studying Dr. Cholkar's speech which is the subject matter of prosecution against him. Exen as it stands reported by the C. I. D. reporter, it is extremely inoffensive. It is, to use Lord Chelmsford's expression, 'pruned of epithet'. It is a reasoned speech. But it discusses a republican form of government. If that is the gravamen of the offensive, then almost every Congressman is an offender. For he will not hesitate to think of, and work for, a republic, if he could not gain his birth-right without complete independence. The fact, is, that the temperance movement has told on the people in the Central and other Provinces, and the Government cannot tolerate it. Bhagvantdevji, whom the local men delight to call Mahatma, is the respected superintendent of the non-co-operation Ashram—a flourishing institution in Nagpur. He is an effective speaker and worker. He must also be silenced in the cause of the Abkari revenues. That is my reading of the

prosecutions in the Central Provinces and elsewhere. By all means prosecute for violence those who incite people to do, or who themselves do, violence to liquor dealers or visitors to liquor shops, but why at this late stage prosecute people under sedition sections? The answer is simple. There is no violence used by responsible persons in connection with drink. Irresponsible violence can be checked in a moment. But that is not what the Government want. They dread the approaching disappearance of the drink and the opium revenue. And they are intent upon preventing (to them) the catastrophe by every means legitimate or otherwise.

If my reading be correct, the remedy is simple. Let us not give the Government even a colourable pretence for prosecution. If sedition means disaffection towards the present system of Government, it is a virtue and a duty. But we do not need to preach it. There is no affection for the system even on the part of men. They hold their titles, as several have admitted, because they have not the courage to risk loss of their wealth. I know more than one who were threatened with confiscation of their Jagirs if they gave up Government favours. I know many more who would not give up their titles or other honours, because they fear loss of banking custom. So far is the influence of the Government felt! But all these would welcome the destruction of a system under which, if they gain a few lacs of rupees, crores are drained out of the country without adequate return. I repeat, therefore, that we need not preach disaffection. We cannot paint the system blacker than it appears to the average audience to-day. All we

need do is to show the people the way to destroy it. That way is self-purification. We shall put the Government in an uncomfortable corner when we oblige them to treat temperance as a vice, and the possession of a spinning wheel a crime. The system can last only so far as we continue to clothe it with an air of respectability by being, or pretending to be, enamoured of it, or by giving Government even a plausible excuse for prosecution.

If the Government treats the possession of the spinning wheel as a crime, it would not be for the first time in history. During the East India Company regime, spinning or weaving had become almost a crime. The labour of these artisans was so cruelly impressed that they were obliged to cut off their own thumbs in order to avoid imprisonment. Many speakers mix up facts and say that the Company's servants cut off the thumbs of artisans. In my opinion, such cutting off would be less cruel than the terrorism which resulted in self-mutilation.

To make temperance a crime would be only a step removed from making the wearing of white caps a crime. And yet I heard whilst at Jabulpore that the servants of a railway department were prohibited from wearing white caps!

And has not the U. P. Government pronounced the movement revolutionary? Hitherto the word "revolution" has been connected with violence, and has as such been condemned by established authority. But the movement of non-co-operation, if it may be considered a revolution, is not an armed revolt: it is an evolutionary revolution, it is a bloodless revolution. The movement is a revolution of thought, of spirit. Non-co-operation is a process of puri-

fication, and, as such, it constitutes a revolution in one's ideas. Its suppression, therefore, would amount to co-operation by coercion. Orders to kill the movement will be orders to destroy, or interfere, with the introduction of the spinning wheel, to prohibit the campaign of temperance, and an incitement, therefore, to violence. For any attempt to compel people by indirect methods to wear foreign clothes, to patronise drink shops, would certainly exasperate them. But our success will be assured when we stand even this exasperation and incitement. We must not retort. Inaction on our part will kill Government madness. For violence flourishes on response, either by submission to the will of the violator, or by counter-violence. My strong advice to every worker is to segregate this evil Government by strict non-co-operation, not even to talk or speak about it, but having recognised the evil, to cease to pay homage to it by co-operation.

The position taken up by the Government of India in its original circular was sound. It conceded the right of free speech and free thought. It threatened to put down by force only actual violence. But I expressed my distrust of it at the time of its publication. The framers expected to be able to kill the movement by patronising indifference or tolerance. But as soon as it began to take effect by demolishing the prestige of Government institutions and by real boycott of foreign cloth, and diminution in the drink revenue, the Government became alarmed, and began to stop free speech and propaganda. And this repression is only by way of rehearsal. The reality has yet to come. Let us be prepared for it. Our determination to continue silent self-purification must remain fixed and

unalterable. We must pass through the fire of terrorism even of the O'Dwyer type, and prove our loyalty to our country, even as Sita proved hers to her lord by the fiery ordeal.

REPRESSION IN THE C. P.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 25, 1921.)

In each province repression is taking its own special turn. In the U. P. the leaders of the movement are being generally left free. Pandit Motilal Nehru, the author of the circular to the Kisans, is left untouched, but the young men who distributed the circulars are imprisoned. Whereas in the C. P. the acknowledged leaders are being picked up one after another and sentenced by an obliging magistracy. The latest instance is that of Mr. Sundarlal. He has undoubtedly a hold on the student world which few possess in the C. P. His is the restraining hand, so far as violence is concerned. But he is a courageous and effective speaker. And therefore, in the opinion of the C. P. Government, he must be put out of harm's way. Here is the charge-sheet against Mr. Sundarlal.

“ That you, on or about the 2nd day of March 1921, at Kharangama, by delivering a speech (to about 5000 people), the substance of which was that the British Government in India was being carried on deliberately and dishonestly with the object of exploiting the country and reducing it to a state of abject poverty and helplessness, and that the British Government is responsible for

epidemics, famines, destruction of trade and industries, and all other misfortunes of the country, which is being so systematically marched towards destruction, that the pledges given to Mahomedans have been broken by the Government, tyrannies and atrocities of the worst type were practised in the Punjab, and people have consequently lost all their faith in the Government, and that the only remedy for this state of things was complete extinction of British rule in India, which is to be brought about by the use of the weapon of non-violent non-cooperation, brought or attempted to bring into hatred or contempt, or excited or attempted to excite disaffection towards the Government established by law in British India and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 124 A of the I. P. C. and within my cognisance. ”

The charge is clear. It is not for violence done or intended. It is purely for spreading disaffection. There is practically nothing in the charge, which has not been repeated during the past twelve months from a thousand platforms. Indeed it may be stated to be the creed of the non-co-operator to give voice to the popular disaffection towards the Government and to spread it. Disaffection is the very essence of non-co-operation. It is the belief of every non-co-operator that the Government, meaning always the system, is wicked, it is one of exploitation of India's resources, it has brought on unprecedented pauperism and consequently famine and disease. The system is responsible for India's helplessness. The British ministers have undoubtedly broken their pledges to the Mussalmans. This and much more,

every non-co-operator does believe, and therefore seeks by non-co-operation to destroy the evil. I congratulate Mr. Sundarlal on the prosecution. Indeed I envy the position occupied by him. Let the C. P. Government remove all the other leaders of the movement, and yet they will find that as a result, the disaffection, which they would crush, is all the deeper and intenser for their mad and thoughtless repression. The duty of the people is clear. They must go on with their programme of construction and thus prepare for the final triumph. We must keep sane in spite of the Government's madness.

AFFLICTED SINDH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 15, 1921.)

A friend sends me the following graphic description of the realities of repression in Sindh :—

“The Commissioner in Sindh has issued a confidential circular asking the Mukhtiarkars to start a counter-agitation against non-co-operation. The Mukhtiarkars in some places are taking strange steps to check non-co-operation. Besides adopting the frank and open method of starting anti-non-co-operation committees, to which one may not take objection, they have at some places asked the people not to allow the non-co-operation propagandists to lodge with them and have asked the Panchayats to prevent people from attending their lectures. Cases have actually happened, in which the propagandists, after they had lodged at a place

(Badin), were asked by the host to leave. At Khipro, in Thar Parkar district, a lecturer, while at some distance from the town, was assaulted by a masked man who did not touch his money, but pulled him down from the camel and struck him with a heavy stick. He took away his Swaraj banner and shawl, leaving the watch and money untouched. It is known all over the district that the assault was instigated by a well-known official, but owing to the terrorism of the police which prevails there, people do not come forward to give statements. Things are worse in the Sakkar district. About three weeks ago, the Sakkar District Conference was held at Ubauvro at a distance of 10 miles from the railway station. The deputy collector of the division told the gharriwallas not to give their carriages to the wearers of Gandhi caps. The gharriwallas dared not incur the displeasure of the deputy collector, and they consented to this through fear. When the President, Mr. Virumal Begraj, Mr. Mulchand, a non-co-operating pleader of Sakkar and others arrived at the station from Sakkar, no carriages were available. A bullock cart driver, who in the end agreed to take them, received a beating from a police Jamadar, and so he also declined to go. The President and others had to walk about a mile in the sun to reach a neighbouring village, where the Panchayat got them conveyances, which brought them to Ubauvro in the heat of the day. At Ubauvro, the people would not come to the Conference, as they had been told that in their absence their houses would be broken into. Arrangements were therefore made by the volunteers of the Conference to patrol the town while the people attended the Conference. During

the Conference, a Mahomedan backed up by the C. I. D. officials insisted on speaking, but would not say on what resolution. When after all allowed to speak, he attacked one of the workers present in offensive language, but people bore with him patiently. After a short time, another, without any provocation, fell upon two volunteers, and belaboured them and two neighbours with blows and shoes. The persons assaulted did not retaliate. Throughout the Conference, the organizers were living in constant apprehension of an outbreak of violence, but in spite of the persistent efforts of the agents of the officials, their incitement to violence proved futile. The gharriwallas refused to take the Conference delegates even on the return journey. At Mirpur Mathelo, where the party got down on the way, Moulvi Taj Mahomed was openly insulted by some of the officials present at the meeting, but he and the audience bore these insults without retaliating by word or deed. Things are daily growing worse in the district since the Conference. The Mukhtiarkars that side have been holding meetings of Mahomedans and telling them that the Hindus were beguiling them and deceiving them. The Mahomedans have therefore been openly telling the Hindus that if they lodge the non-co-operators with them, they (Mahomedans) would commit thefts in the houses of Hindus. In one village, the Congress party got down at the local temple. Soon after about 30 Mahomedans armed with lathis surrounded the temple, saying that they were waiting to beat the lecturers. In the end, the temple-keeper persuaded the party to leave by another door. At Ghotki, Mr. Choithram Valecha, the young Secretary of the Sakkar Congress

Committee, was surrounded by about 30 or 40 Mahomedans armed with lathis. He stood calmly, prepared to receive the beating. At this, a number of young Hindus came up to Mr. Valecha and sat down quietly by him. The local Hindu Panchayat, becoming aware of the situation, sent men for Mr. Valecha and the two or three other Congress volunteers accompanying him. When they went to the Panchayat, the 30 or 40 armed Mahomedans followed them and sat in the Panchayat meeting. They said that they wanted to beat Mr. Valecha. The Panchayat appealed to Mr. Valecha to leave the town. He replied that he would leave the town, when he had finished his work there, and not before. The Panchayat seeing him firm, asked the Mahomedans to leave, so that it might proceed with its work. The Mahomedans only laughed in return, refusing to leave the meeting. After fruitlessly waiting for one hour, the Panchayat saw no alternative but to persuade Mr. Valecha to leave the town accompanied by about 40 Hindus, who saw him off at the station. No step has been taken by the higher officials, so far as we know, against any one of those who have adopted these methods of threatening, coercion, actual violence and threats of violence to prevent the message of the Congress being carried to the villages. Are these the methods, with which Lord Reading or Sir George Lloyd wishes to fight the movement?"

The last sentence is evidently a friendly hit at me. It is to remind me that I have said some complimentary things about Lord Reading and Sir George Lloyd. My compliments stand notwithstanding these revelations. They prove the essence of my charge against the system,

that it makes the best of administrators powerless for good. Sir George, probably, has as much influence over the Commissioner of Sindh, as he has over a street-urchin. He has to fear the former, and can, if he wishes, even frighten the latter. The great feat of Lord Reading's is to invite Mr. Thompson of the Punjab fame to accept a higher post, and succeed in inducing him to condescend to do so. Sir George Lloyd, where he can personally supervise, shows himself to be tactful and yielding as a rule. Lord Reading can procure palliatives, as in the case just mentioned. But Sir George will not resign, because the Commissioner of Sindh says he is as good as Governor Lloyd. Nor would Reading resign, because the officials in the plains laugh at his intentions to do justice. Both honestly believe that without them, things might at least have been worse. Non-co-operation has stepped in to show to all who care that they may not flirt with evil and hope to do good. When the basis is evil, a superstructure of good adds strength to evil. It would be wrong to blame such administrators, because they fail for they fail in spite of themselves. Our non-co-operation will open their eyes to the depth of the evil that is in the system, if we will discriminate between the system, and its administrators, all of whom certainly are not bad.

But all this academic discussion about the merits and demerits of administrators, can bring little comfort to the Sindhi sufferers. I tender my congratulations to them for their courage and patience under very trying circumstances. If they continue to suffer patiently and bravely, the end will be brought nearer by this unbridled and

unscrupulous repression. We must try, by patient endurance, to win over to us our misguided countrymen, who become easy tools in the hands of unprincipled officials. Gradually, as in other parts of India, so in Sindh, the villagers will shed the fear of the officials, welcome Congress and Khilafat men as their real friends and deliverers. If we have faith, presently it will become impossible to play the Mahomedans against the Hindus and *vice versa*.

A VENOMOUS PROSECUTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 18, 1921.)

During my travels in the United Provinces, I have come across extraordinary tales of repression. For the present I propose only to deal with two cases of prosecution which I do not hesitate to consider venomous. Messrs. Mohansing Dermal and Shambhunath, a Zamin-dar of Sitapur and ex-Tahsildar were called upon to show cause why they should not file security for an offence described thus in the summons:—

Whereas it appears from the report of the Patwari at Ramgadth that

[1] Th. Mohansing of Ramgadth.

[2] B. Shambhunath, late Naib Tahsildar, at present at Bhowali and Bhunyadhar are taking part in anti-Government agitation and selling notes for the Tilak Swaraj Fund, as such agitation against the Government established by law is likely to eventually lead to a distur-

bance of the public tranquility and breaches of the peace, hence these persons are called on to show cause why they should not be bound over to keep the peace for one year in personal bounds of Rs. 1,000 each and each in two surities in Rs. 500 each.

On the face of it, the summons discloses no offence. But the painful humour of the situation is accentuated upon reading Patwari's statement. It refers to the accused having paid the collections to Pandit Motilal Nehru and having been found in the company of such a confirmed non-co-operator as Pandit Nehru (Senior) in a place like Ramgadha sanatorium. It is true, the magistrate has not the courage to mention this very relevant fact, but as the second accused made it abundantly clear in his statement, his being with and having served Panditji was the sole offence. The accused is a well-known man in his district. He is known also to be a consumptive in the last stages. His right lung is almost gone. The other, and his bowels are badly affected. He has not taken any active part in any political work for many months. He had not made any speeches. He was in Ramgadh like Punditji himself recouping his health. Thus there was absolutely no excuse for the magistrate to arrest the accused or to go on with his trial after the arrest. The fact is, the magistrate idea was evidently to terrorise all those who had anything to do with non-co-operation even to the extent of collecting subscriptions or helping non-co-operation in villages. It may be said that such things are really an exception and that their importance need not be exaggerated. I am unable to subscribe to the doctrine. The magistrate in the instances quoted may have adopted an original

method of acting, but my observation of the United Provinces leads me to the conclusion that there is subtle terrorism going on in the United Provinces as nowhere else except perhaps in Sindh, designed solely to kill non-co-operation activities, no matter how non-violent and otherwise innocent they might be. A most unscrupulous use is being made of the statement of regrets issued by the Brothers. The users know the manner and the method of the Brothers' apology. But for them distortion of a brave act is the least wicked among the wickednesses that they resort to for the sake of bending non-co-operators and weaning others from their way. I am satisfied that the poorer people who dare to accept the banner of non-co-operation are molested in order to prevent them from joining Congress Committees, and they are by equally questionable methods made to join the so-called peace-promoting organisations which are as a matter of fact anarchical in the sense, that the methods adopted for promoting them are both illegal and immoral. The United Provinces Government are doing in a clever and cowardly manner what Sir Michael O'Dwyer's Government did in an honest blunt manner. He followed up the logic of his policy and had the courage to arrest all the leaders and to create an atmosphere for an open Jallianwala. I have drawn attention elsewhere to the fact that tragedies worse than Jallianwala had been enacted in the Punjab during the recruiting period ; but they passed unnoticed because leaders were not arrested. The U. P. Government will not arrest leaders of the front/rank except in isolated cases like Mr. Sherwani's. They have arrested Mr. Ranga Iyer. They have not as yet touched Pandit Jawa-

harlal Nehru or Mr. Joseph, though all the three issued their challenge simultaneously. I have taken the trouble of reducing to writing the results of my observation in the United Provinces, because I saw Mr. Chintamani's speech energetically defending the measures of his Government, and because I was pressed to encourage ministers who were working out the reforms to the point of complete responsible government. In my humble opinion the Reforms and the Reforms ministers are being used, wherever possible, for sustaining the clever but unscrupulous bureaucracy. That the ministers are unconscious and unwilling instruments, does not lessen the evil of the policy, though it is an extenuating circumstance in favour of the ministers. I am loth to believe that Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad and Mr. Chintamani know what they are doing. I am inclined to think that they are irresistibly drawn into the bureaucratic net, and the plausibilities put before them induce them to excuse what they would otherwise condemn without any hesitation. The Raja of Mahmuddabad is stated by the *Independent* to have defended the action of a District Judge who suspended an acting munsarim in East Badaun for failing to produce a written declaration of loyalty by his son who had been served with a notice under section 144. He was suspended on the 10th May pending production of the required declaration. No doubt the son was living with the father. The result was that on the 6th of June the father produced the son's application to join an Aman Sabha and procured reinstatement by selling his son's liberty of action. If we could but peep behind the scene, we would probably find confidential despatches

seeking to justify the suspension of the poor munsarim. Be that however as it may, we have here the melancholy fact that pressure is being put upon Government servants in order to compel their boys to withdraw from the non-co-operation movement. I have no doubt that the Raja Sahab of three years ago would have written and spoken far more energetically against such wicked demoralisation of officials and their families than I am doing. What is however still more to the purpose than the drawing of attention to the fact that ministers are being made tools in unscrupulous hands, is that non co-operators must not be disheartened over the illegalities and the immoralities referred to here, but that they should realise that such repression and even worse must be expected by us and cheerfully accepted as the lot of reformers all the world over. The persecutors really believe that we are in the wrong, that we are harming the country and that the means do not matter so long as the movement for which we stand is crushed. Repression, therefore, must be treated by us as a prelude to victory and must therefore be welcomed and be utilised by us for making our determination still more rigid.

A MOCK TRIAL

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 25, 1921.)

I have already dealt in a previous issue with the disgraceful behaviour of a Karachi crowd * on 25th July last

* Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of August 4, 1921, —

Bad of Karachi—Though I have not read the papers regarding the stoning of Europeans in Karachi by a crowd that was incensed against the

upon the receipt of the news that Swami Krishnanand, a popular preacher, reformer and the soul of the picketing movement in Kharachi, was arrested, tried and sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment inside of three hours. The court house was surrounded by the military, and the trial took place practically with closed doors. The Swami was arrested on the 20th but set free after an hour's detention. He was without a warning re-arrested on the 25th on the same charge. He was charged with having assaulted a constable 'in the discharge of his duty.' Prof. Vaswani who was in touch with the Swami and who was present at the court, testifies that the Swami never assaulted the constable, but that on the other hand he, the Swami, was fairly severely assaulted by the latter for having refused to move on whilst he was engaged in a conversation with a friend. The crowd believed implicitly in the innocence of the Swami. And in its madness, it selected every European passerby and every one with a European hat for venting its wrath. Among the Europeans assaulted was Mr. Price, M. L. A.

imprisonment of Swami Krishnanand, from what I have heard through friends from Sindhi I must confess that those who threw stones have done a disservice to the sacred cause they had at heart. They have also shown little honour to the Swami by breaking the pledge of non-violence. The Swami is undoubtedly a popular and fearless worker. He had been producing by organised picketing a marked impression on the receipts of the liquor-dealers. I hear too that he was falsely charged with having assaulted some one. Granting all this, it was the clear duty of the populace to observe perfect self-restraint. It is a most thoughtless thing to assault innocent Europeans, because the police have wrongly prosecuted and a magistrate has wrongly convicted. Incidents such as these make civil disobedience difficult, if not impossible. Let the crowd that so misbehaved in Karachi honour the Swami by boycotting foreign cloth, and by spinning or weaving.

Whatever the provocation, however great the Swami's innocence and whatever his status, the crowd had no business to lose temper. Victory is impossible until we are able to keep our temper under the gravest provocation. Calmness under fire is a soldier's indispensable quality. A non-co-operator is nothing if he cannot remain calm and unperturbed under a fierce fire of provocation. We must lie on the bed chosen by us. We must not expect the Government to remain calm in all circumstances. It has its creed as we have ours. It is calm up to a point. It will sit still so long as we seem to play. Its creed is to strike terror immediately we are serious. The Swami and his following were serious and the Government delivered the blow. It was at this stage that our creed was put upon its trial and we failed. It is true but it is irrelevant, that Prof. Vasvani and other staunch workers tried to curb the fury of the mob and even partly succeeded and prevented worse things from happening. The fact that matters very much is, that the crowd lost self-control at all. There was no occasion for it to gather. Having gathered it ought to have remained cool-humoured throughout. It was entitled to vent its anger by discarding all foreign cloth, by making up its mind to turn to weaving and picketing liquor-shops. That would have been a death-blow to the Government. As it was, its impotent rage was very near a death-blow to the movement for which the crowd ostensibly stood.

There should be no mistake. There is no civil disobedience possible, until the crowds behave like disciplined soldiers. And we cannot resort to civil disobedience, unless we can assure every Englishman that he is as safe

in India as he is in his own home. It is not enough that we give the assurance. Every Englishman and Englishman must *feel* safe, not by reason of the bayonet at their disposal but by reason of our living creed of non-violence. That is the condition not only of success but our own ability to carry on the movement in its present form. There is no other way of conducting the campaign of non-co-operation.

Let us bear the Swami's farewell message in mind : 'carry on the anti-liquor campaign and help the Bhangī.' He could not have delivered a better message. If we banish liquor and raise the Bhangī to our level, low as it is, we are very near Swaraj.

Of course the Sindh authorities have lost their head. I see proclamations prohibiting people from walking where and as they like, from carrying anything but walking sticks.

The lesson of the mock trial as Prof. Vasvani has truly called it and the aftermath, is that we must expect more mock trials as the heat of non-co-operation grows and the closing months approach, and that we must be prepared calmly to face the imprisonment of innocence without retaliation and fury, or we must be prepared to court well-deserved disaster. It will be a cruel pity, if, when we are so near the cherished goal, we should fall back by our inability to control crowds.

ANOTHER GURKHA CHARGE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 3, 1921.)

It almost seems as if Bengal is to be the first in suffering and therefore the first in winning Swaraj. The Chandpur outrage is still fresh in the memory. Now comes the news of an equally terrible outrage in Chittagong. Let Babu Prasannakumar Sen Secretary of the District Congress Committee tell the tale in his own words.

‘I take this opportunity of giving you an account of the latest turn of events at Chittagong. Mr. Sengupta, President, and St. Mohim | Chandra Das, Secretary, Chittagong District Congress Committee and sixteen others were arrested on the 2nd July last for taking part in a procession without licence contrary to a notice previously issued by the local authorities under sec. 30 of the Police Act. Their trial came up on the 19th October. They were charged under sec. 151 I.P.C. and sec. 32 of the Police Act. The accused did not offer any defence and were each sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months on the 20th of October. It was known in the town that the noble prisoners would be taken to the Central Jail at Alipur the same evening. People began to collect before the Jail gate from 4 o'clock. Band parties, concert parties and Sankirtan parties were also brought in. In the evening the whole town was illuminated and there was bomb firing and rocket flying. This the people did without any instructions from the Congress Organisation. Shortly after 8 P.M. the prisoners

were taken out of jail and placed in Police carriages for being conveyed to the railway station. A procession with torch light, band parties, concert parties followed the carriages in an extremely orderly manner.

The procession having reached the approaches of the railway station, a *posse* of Gurkhas numbering about a hundred and armed with guns came out of ambush. Lights were put out by some person not yet known, and the Gurkhas suddenly and without any notice whatsoever sprang upon innocent and peaceful persons with all the savagery they could command with cries of '*maro*', '*maro*', '*lagao*', '*lagao*'. They assaulted right and left anything and everything that came in their way, hackney carriage drivers and their horses not excepted. They continued wounding people with the butt-end of their guns up to a considerable distance from the station premises and ceased when a whistle blew from the first class gangway. It is reported nearly a hundred persons got bleeding wounds in different parts of their bodies, and about three hundred persons received aching blows. The District Magistrate Mr. Strong and Additional District Magistrate Mr. Burrows were present on the spot. One prominent Peace and Order Association man was seen taking part in the assault and crying at the top of his voice, "*Maro, Maro*", and after the assault was over, he was seen in company with the District Magistrate. After the assault outside the station premises, a European military officer presumably commanding the Gurkhas entered the platform. He made a show of proceeding to the compartment reserved for prisoners, but made a sudden left wheel and began to push people who

had been there with platform tickets. No warning was given, no request was made to move away from or clear the platform. We suspect the object was to create an occasion for another assault, but the people moved away peacefully, so that when the Gurkha were brought to the platform, they got nothing to fall upon. Both outside and inside the platform, serious loss of life would have occurred, had not people remained calm and non-violent under great provocation. They refrained from offering counter-assault upon the Gurkhas who in their fury got themselves mixed in the crowd and could be easily smashed to pieces, their arms notwithstanding. It should be noted that the Chandpur tragedy took place on the night of the 20th June 1921 and is re-enacted at Chittagong on the night of the 20th October, 1921, in a perhaps more hideous form under circumstances which can offer no excuse whatever.

The local Congress Committee, the Chittagong Association and the local Khilafat Committee met at an extraordinary emergency meeting on the evening of the 21st instant and appointed an independent committee of enquiry. The Committee is sitting in the Jatra Mohan Sen Hall from day to day and is recording evidence. Photographers have been engaged to take photographs of the wounded. We shall be thankful if you kindly advise us as to what steps should be taken to redress our grievances in this respect.

Swadeshi propaganda is being pushed on with greater vigour than heretofore, and ere long we hope to banish the only about 5 p. c. foreign cloth which is visible now at Chittagong.

Up to now thirty persons have been convicted in connection with the Congress propaganda, and twenty-seven of them are still in jail. Prosecution is pending against six.

The facts are set forth with such precision that it is hard to suspect any exaggeration. And yet it is equally hard to credit the authorities with such utter callousness as is to be inferred from the description given by Prasanna Babu. Manifestly the crowd was in a holiday mood. Thank God, prisons have ceased to frighten us. The people therefore illuminated their houses, and went in a procession to see the prisoners off. There could be no violent intent in this. But it was too much for the Magistrate. He evidently thought that the deterrent effect of the punishment he had inflicted was being counteracted by these rejoicings and that in time he might have to turn the whole of Chittagong into a prison to accommodate the whole population. He therefore resorted to the Gurkha charge. It is difficult (assuming the truth of the report) in any other manner to account for the brutal action taken against totally innocent holiday makers. It is clear, too, that the members of the so called peace and order associations are playing into the hands of the bureaucracy. These are no doubt trying circumstances. But we counted the cost when we entered upon the course. We must pay it. We must go through the fiery ordeal, and prove our purity before we are admitted to the promised land. The leaders and the people of Chittagong deserve to be warmly congratulated upon their exemplary self-restraint and calmness under circumstances the most provoking. I can tender no

other advice than to say that they should pursue their even course in spite of greater dangers still. The only redress that is open to us is each time to show greater courage and greater self-control, till at last the tyrant falls exhausted under the weight of his own effort. The non-co-operators of Chittagong ought not to feel irritated against the members of Aman Sabhas or of the Government. They but act according to their natures. A non-co-operator's nature is neither to retaliate nor to bend. He must stand erect unmoved by the storm raging round him. If we may truthfully sing and pray, let us sing :

“So long Thy power has blest me, sure it still
Will lead me on, o'er moor and fen,
O'er crag and torrent, till the night is gone”.

THE AFGHAN BOGEY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 4, 1921.)

The reader will find elsewhere a string of questions put by a correspondent. * The most important relates to a speech delivered by Maulana Mahomed Ali on the fear of

*A String of Questions :—To the Editor, *Young India*. Sir, You know that Maulana Mohammed Ali has publicly declared from a platform in the Madras Presidency that he would assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he came towards India against those who have emasculated Islam and who are in wrongful possession of the Holy Place, etc. I think Indian opinion is divided on this question. The Moderates are bent upon crushing any such movement. Even the nationalists such as Lala Lajpat Rai and Messrs. C. R. Das and Malaviya have not spoken out their mind—nay even you have not taken any notice of this very important speech. It may be high treason to show sympathy and give open assistance to the King's

an Afghan invasion. I have not read Maulana Mahomed Ali's speech referred to by the correspondent. But whether he does or not, I would, in a sense, certainly assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he waged war against the British Government. That is to say I would openly tell my countrymen that it would be a crime to help a Government which had lost the confidence of the nation to remain in

enemy, but in these days of frank talk and candid speech one is eager to hear the decision of leaders. It is a vital question. The publicists—I have the honour of being one—are at a loss to form any opinion.

The next point on which I beg to address you is this. Do you suppose that only the God-fearing, or for that matter believers in one God, are to be non-co-operators? A friend of mine who is a Rationalist—thank God I myself am a staunch Mussalman,—is a *pucca* nationalist. He is ready to sacrifice everything at the altar of the Motherland and for the restoration of justice to a weaker nation, but he has nothing to present to God because he denies His very existence. My friend is ready and has already undertaken to wear khaddar. He is an admirer of Tilak Maharaj and freely adds to the Fund by frequent donations. But is he a "non-co-operator"? Has he got a place in your list? Can he be admitted to your Ashram if he is not deficient in other requisites?

The third difficulty lies in the fact that you say that to be a member of this Government-satanic as it is—is sinful but still you tolerate the existence of so many of your fellow-countrymen in that service and in those associations. You do not invite them to your fold *at present*. Is it justifiable? If to serve the present Government is a social or religious crime, which I think it is, then why let them be there? Does expediency hold good in the domain of religion, self-purification, and self-reliance?

And lastly what do you mean by "attaining Swaraj within one year"? Does it imply that the Nation would at the coming session of the Congress declare itself free and out of the British Empire? Or if merely the consciousness of freedom, the adoption of Swadeshi, and the partial boycott of law courts and Schools mean Swaraj within India, And if, may God forbid, our boycott movement fails, then does it mean that those who have been asked to give up their study or practice for *one* year can return to the tabooed institutions?

Bareilly,
15th April

Yours etc.
AHFAD HUSAIN.

power. On the other hand I would not ask Indians to raise levies for the Amir. That would be against the creed of non-violence accepted by both Hindus and Muslims for the purpose of the Khilafat, the Punjab, and Swaraj. And I apprehend that Maulana Mahomed Ali could not mean more in his speech than what I have suggested. He could not very well do otherwise, so long as the Hindu-Muslim compact subsists. The Muslims are free to dissolve the compact. But it would be found upon an examination of the case, that the compact is indissoluble.

Mr Gandhi wrote in reply —

I have dealt with the first question in a separate article. As for the second question, I think that only God-fearing people can become true non-co-operators. But the programme of non-co-operation does not require a man to declare his faith. Any person believing in non-violence and accepting the non-co-operation programme can certainly become a non-co-operator. As to the third question the correspondent misapprehends the position. The nation has not embarked on complete non-co-operation, not for want of faith or will, but for want of ability. It has, therefore, not called upon Government servants as yet to give up their posts. But any such servant is free to throw up his office whenever he likes. But there cannot be such a call until all reasonable precautions are taken against an outbreak of violence. Not until the nation is in a position to find occupation for such men, can the call therefore be made. Thus, here, there is no question of expediency as it is generally understood. But purest religion is highest expediency. Many things are lawful but they are not all expedient. The law, the ideal of non-co-operation, is before the country.

As to the fourth question, my meaning of Swaraj is that India should be able to regulate her life without any restraint from outside. She should be able to regulate her military expenditure and the method of raising her revenue. She should be able to withdraw every one of her soldiers from wheresoever she chooses. How this will be, or can be, done depends upon the nation. India's representatives freely chosen by the people must decide upon the method of execution. If Swaraj is not established during one year, if I can help it, certainly not a single boy who has left his school or a lawyer his practice will return thereto.

Dissolution of the compact means destruction of India's purpose. I cannot conceive the present possibility of Hindus and Muslims entering upon a joint armed revolt. And Muslims can hardly expect to succeed with any plan of an armed revolt.

However, I warn the reader against believing in the bogey of an Afghan invasion. Their own military writers have often let us into the secret that many of the punitive expeditions were manufactured for giving the soldiers a training or keeping idle armed men occupied. A weak, disarmed, helpless, credulous, India does not know how this Government has kept her under its hypnotic spell. Even some of the best of us to-day really believe that the military budget is being piled up for protecting India against foreign aggression. I suggest that it is being piled up for want of faith in the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, the Pathans, and the Rajputs, *i. e.*, for want of faith in us and for the purpose of keeping us under forced subjection. My belief (I write under correction) is that the anxiety of the Government always to have a treaty with the Amir was based, not, so much upon the fear of a Russian invasion as upon the fear of losing the confidence of the Indian soldiery. To-day there is certainly no fear of a Russian invasion. I have never believed in the Bolshevik menace. And why should any Indian Government, to use the favourite phrase of the erstwhile idol of Bengal, 'broadbased upon a people's affection', fear Russian, Bolshevik or any menace? Surely a contented, and a powerful India (all the more), in alliance with Great Britain, can any day meet any invasion upon her. But this Government has deliberately emasculated us, kept us

under the perpetual fear of our neighbours and the whole world, and drained India of her splendid resources so that she has lost faith in herself either for defence or for dealing with the simple problem of the growing poverty. I, therefore, do certainly hope that the Amir will not enter into any treaty with this Government. Any such treaty can only mean unholy bargain against Islam and India. This Government being unwilling to part with O'Dwyerism as an 'emergency' measure, being unwilling to keep its faith with the Muslims, (I must decline to treat the Government of India separately from the Imperial Government) and being unwilling to let India rise to her full height, wants Afghanistan to enter into a treaty of offence against India. I hope that there is but one opinion so far as non-co-operators are concerned. Whilst unwilling ourselves, we cannot wish others to co-operate with the Government.

OUR NEIGHBOURS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 18, 1921.)

Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border, and thus do I not become a direct party to violence? Thus asks Mr. Andrews. My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish as to invade India on the strength of my article. But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Andrews. I therefore hasten to

inform all whom it may concern that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody to come to our assistance but am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover, I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means, I would therefore strain every nerve to keep the Afghans out of the Indian border, but my anxiety to keep them off the Indian border will not go so far as to assist the Government with men or money.

In my article I have put my position as clearly as possible. For me the existing Government is the most intolerable of all, it is the greatest danger to the manhood of India and I would welcome its *re-formation* at any cost. It is my settled conviction that it is a Godless Government. That there are good Englishmen and good Indians connected with it makes it all the more dangerous for India. It keeps the nation's eyes of the inherent evil of it. My attack is not against individuals, it is directed against the system, against the aggregate called the Government. The best of Viceroys have been powerless to eradicate the poison of the system. The poison is its foundation. Therefore I can reconcile myself to all the worst that can happen to India in the place of the present system.

What however I would do is totally different from what I can do I am sorry to have to confess that the movement has not yet acquired such hold on the soldier class as to embolden them to refuse assistance to the Government in time of need. When the soldier class has

realised that they live for the nation, and that it is a travesty of a soldier's calling when he undertakes to kill to order, the battle of India's worldly freedom is won without more. As it is, the Indian soldier is as much subject to fear as the layman. He fills the recruiting ranks, because he believes that there is no other means of livelihood. The Government has made the profession of killing attractive by a system of special rewards, and by a system of skilfully devised punishments has made it well-nigh impossible for the soldier, once he is in, to get out without difficulty. In these circumstances I do not delude myself with the belief that the British Government will be without Indian help in the event of an immediate Afghan invasion. But it was my duty, especially when challenged, to put before the nation the position logically arising from non-co-operation. It was necessary, too, to warn the nation against being frightened by the Afghan bogey.

The second part of the question contains, in my opinion, a misconception of non-violence. It is no part of the duty of a non-violent non-co-operator to assist the Government against war made upon it by others. A non-violent non-co-operator may not secretly or openly encourage or assist any such war. He may not take part directly or indirectly in it. But it is no part of his duty to help the Government to end the war. On the contrary his prayer would be, as it must be, for the defeat of a power which he seeks to destroy. I, therefore so far as my creed of non-violence is concerned, can contemplate an Afghan invasion with perfect equanimity, and equally so far as India's safety is concerned. The Afghans have no

quarrel with India. They are a God-fearing people. I warn non-co-operators against judging the Afghans by the few savage specimens we see in Bombay or Calcutta. It is a superstition to suppose that they will overrun India if the British post at the frontier was withdrawn. Let us remember that there is nothing to prevent them from overrunning India to-day, if they wished to. But they are as fond of their country as we claim to be fond of ours. I must devote a separate article to an examination of the difficult problem that faces the residents near the frontier.

THE FRONTIER FRIENDS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 25, 1921.)

The Punjabees living on the Frontier deserve the sympathy of the whole of India. They are exposed to attacks from the neighbouring tribes, they are defenceless, and from all the accounts received by me, the Government seem to give them little or no protection, and now-a-days the rule for the officers, if any one complains, is to refer the complainant to the Ali Brothers and to me. If we had charge of the Frontier, I know what he would have done. We would certainly have died in the attempt to defend the unarmed population of the districts. We would have, if necessary, armed the population for self-defence. But what is more, we would have won over the tribesmen and turned them from marauding bands into trustworthy neighbours. But we have to take things as they are. I assume that the Hindus and the Mussalmans

are friendly to one another, and that no Mussalman traitorously helps the tribesmen against his Hindu brother. The Mussalman population this side of the Frontier is in an exceptionally strong position to help.

We must not despair of the tribesmen. We have too often considered them to be hopeless. In my opinion, they are amenable to reason. They are God fearing. They do not loot merely for pleasure. I believe that they are themselves coming under the influence of the wave of self-purification that is spreading.

I know that the process of reforming the tribesmen is slow and tedious. It provides poor comfort to those that are robbed of their possessions or their dear ones.

The difficulty is to be traced to the same cause—we fear Englishmen, and we have become slaves. We fear the tribesmen and we are satisfied with our slavery, we are thankful that we are protected by the former against the latter. I cannot imagine greater humiliation for a self-respecting man to be dependent, for the safety of himself or his family, on those who he thinks prey upon him. I would prefer total destruction of myself and my all to purchasing safety at the cost of my manhood. This feeling of helplessness in us has really arisen from our deliberate dismissal of God from our common affairs. We have become atheists for all practical purposes. And therefore we believe that in the long run we must rely upon physical force for our protection. In the face of physical danger, we cast all our philosophy to the winds. Our daily life is a negation of God. If then we would but have a little trust in God, *i. e.*, ourselves, we shall find no difficulty with the tribesmen. Only in that case, we

will have to be prepared at times to surrender our possessions and under certain circumstances our lives rather than our honour. We must refuse to believe that our neighbours are savages incapable of responding to the finer in man.

Thus consistently with our self-respect, there are but two courses open to us, to prepare in so far as we wish to defend ourselves however weakly against robbery and plunder or to believe in the capacity of our neighbours to respond to the nobler instinct in man and to endeavour to reform the tribesman. I apprehend that the two process will go hand in hand. We must avoid the third at any cost, that is, reliance in the British bullet to protect from harm. It is the surest way to national suicide.

If my writings can reach the tribesmen, I would certainly urge them to leave their predatory habits. Inasmuch as they loot a single man or woman, they believe the teaching of the Prophet whose name they prize above all others and whom they believe to be the messenger of the God of mercy and justice. It is the duty of every Mussalman and Ulema who has any influence with these simple men to tell them that if they will play their part in defending Islam from impending danger, the least they can do is to refrain from molesting their neighbours, who have done not only no harm to them but who, whether they are Hindus or Mussalmans, are doing their best to safeguard the honour of Islam.

THE AFGHAN ALARM

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 1, 1921.)

It must be a matter of surprise to many people as it is to me that Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal should be alarmed at the Afghan cry raised in interested quarters. He is a believer in full Swaraj, and I venture to suggest to Mr. Pal that we cannot establish Swaraj in India, till we rid ourselves of the feeling of helplessness. Swaraj means our preparedness to deal with the Afghan and every other menace in our country. The whole scheme of non-co-operation is based on trusting other people, and if they prove untrustworthy, on our being prepared to meet their deceit by self-suffering. I remind Mr. Pal of what he truly said at Allahabad at the Hindu-Mahomedan Conference in reply to Dr. Sapru, that the same power of combination, resourcefulness and suffering that would end the present system of slavery, would enable us to deal with every other system of a similar nature.

Pan-Islamism, which Mr. Pal fears, is an admirable doctrine in so far as a Mussalman wishes the solidarity of all Moslem states. It would be a dangerous doctrine, if it were to mean a combination of Islamic powers for the purpose of exploiting the world or converting it to Islam by force. No sane Mussalman of my acquaintance has ever entertained the latter idea. The world is growing sick of the domination of brute force.

I assure Mr. Pal that I do not believe in flirtation with any sentiment. I reject those that are bad, and hug those

that are good. I do not believe that serious Mussalmans will welcome. Afghan rule, any more than serious Hindus would. In writing my article on the Afghan Bogey, I was minded only to defend the correct position of a comrade, and to warn India against being frightened by the interested cry.

I totally dissent from Mr. Pal's view that the event of an Afghan invasion, or even the mere circulation of a rumour of such invasion will incite a very large part of our Moslem population to lawlessness, if not to open "revolt." On the contrary it is my firm belief that the Mussalmans have too much at stake to-day—the honour of their religion—to do any such foolish act. As Maulana Shaukat Ali has said so often, the Mussalmans are too shrewd to mix up violence with non-violence. Mr. Pal has done a very grave injustice to the Hindus by attributing to 'a very large proportion' of Hindus 'a desire to settle their own account with the Mahomedans'. He has, I venture to assure him, entirely misread the Hindu mind. The Hindus are as much in earnest about the cow, as the Mussalmans about the Khilafat. And the former know that they cannot save the cow—the cherished dream of every Hindu—without the goodwill of the latter. I promise that the Hindus will forget every wrong done in the past by every Mussalman, when the latter 'help them to save the cow,' as I know every Mussalman will feel eternally grateful to the Hindus, if he finds that he has retrieved the honour of Islam by their voluntary aid.

I deny *in toto* the truth of the proposition laid down by Mr. Pal, that Moslems and Hindus would welcome an

Afghan invasion. The protests that have been made against the supposed intentions of Maulana Mahomed Ali are surely enough to convince any body that India will not tolerate an Afghan invasion.

Mr. Pal suggests that if the Amir invades and if we do not aid the Government, there can only be a revolution. I venture to suggest another alternative. If India as a non-co-operating India does not assist, the Government will make terms with the people. I do not consider the British people to be so utterly devoid of commonsense or resourcefulness as to leave India, rather than come to terms with her and heal the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds. That India does not yet possess the power to command attention, I know only too well. I have simply suggested a contingent alternative.

Mr. Pal sees a difference between Lalaji's and my declaration at Simla and our previous declarations. I know, none—neither Lalaji nor I—have ever welcomed an Afghan invasion. But I gladly lay down my own position in categorical terms.

(1) I do not believe that the Afghans want to invade India.

(2) I believe that the Government is fully prepared to meet an Afghan invasion.

(3) I am sorry to confess that if, there was an Afghan invasion, every Raja and Maharaja will render unconditional assistance to the Government.

(4) I believe too that we as a people are still so demoralised, diffident and distrustful of Afghan intentions, and Hindus and Mussalmans of one another, that many would in mere panic rush to the help of the

Government and thus still further strengthen the chain that binds India.

(5) In theory, it is possible to distinguish between an invasion of India and an invasion of the British Government for the purpose of the Khilafat. In practice, I do not believe in the Afghans invading India to embarrass the Government, and being able in the event of being successful to resist the temptation of establishing a kingdom in India.

(6) In spite of such belief, I hold it to be contrary to the faith of a non-co-operator to render unconditional assistance to a Government which he seeks to end or mend.

(7) A handful of conscientious objectors may make no impression on the then current of events, but they will sow the seed for raising a manly India.

(8) I would rather see India perished at the hands of Afghans, than purchase freedom from Afghan invasion at the cost of her honour. To have India defended by an unrepentant Government that keeps the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds still bleeding, is to sell India's honour.

(9) My faith, however, in the British nation is such that when we have shown sufficient strength of purpose and undergone enough measure of self-sacrifice, the British people will respond fully. My reading of history is that they do not yield to justice, pure and simple. It is too abstract for their "commonsense." But they are far seeing enough to respond to justice when it is allied with force. Whether it is brute force as soul force, they do not mind.

(10) It is the duty of every non-co-operator to let the

Afghans know that he believes in the capacity of non-co-operation to restore the Khilafat to pre-war status and that India does not want their armed intervention, that non-co-operators would appreciate their refusal to enter into any deal with the British Government for holding India in subjection, and that India has none but the friendliest feelings for her neighbours.

MEN, MONEY AND MUNITIONS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 13,, 1921.)

These were the words in which Mr. Das summed up the All-India Congress Committee's resolution * about one crore members, one crore rupees, and twenty lacs of spinning wheels. This programme is neither elaborate nor intricate. It requires practically no sacrifice. It does require organisation, will and industry. We have twenty-one Congress provinces, and, happily, each province has workers capable of organising their respective provinces for the Congress programme. I would strongly advise them to devote themselves to the working of registering members, collecting subscriptions, and introducing spinning wheels. Let the workers remember that there is no time to lose. We must be able to reach every adult

* The All-India Congress Committee met at Bezwada in the last week of March and passed a resolution instituting a programme of intensive effort in non-co-operation. The resolution required that before June 30, the Congress should raise one crore rupees for the Tilak Swarajya Fund, enrol one crore members for the Congress and introduce twenty lakhs of Charkas in the country.

male and female in our respective provinces and give them a chance of coming to the Congress register. We must give a chance even to boys and girls of understanding to subscribe to the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund, † and take to every family the life giving

† Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of March 16, 1921 —

All-India Tilak Swaraj Fund :—The Punjab deserves the first place in having organised the Tilak memorial in a methodical manner. The new Committees should now be in working order and we must dot the whole of the country with collectors for the fund. In the Punjab, the Congress Committee has issued one rupee receipts, thus expecting those who can to pay nothing less than one rupee. A memorial week, subsequently extended to a fortnight was declared, and trusted volunteers went round to make collections. They have collected over one lac of rupees in that province. The Committee has already forwarded Rs. 25,000 on account of its contribution to the All-India Congress Committee.

In my opinion, the rest of us cannot do better than copy the useful example of the Punjab. It is necessary to fix the sum we should collect. One crore of rupees for the whole of India is a most modest tribute to the memory of a patriot so great as the Lokmanya. It is a trifle when we think of the object with which the memory of the deceased is to be associated. To contribute one crore of rupees towards the attainment of Swaraj is not much. And it may be noted here that the money is not to be spent in foreign or other propaganda, but largely in spinning, weaving, and other educational activity. It is to be spent in educating our children. The collection has to be distributed among the twenty-one provinces and should be finished before the 30th June next. Each province will on an average be expected to collect about five lacs of rupees. But Bombay, Gujarat, Bengal, Punjab, and such other provinces, may be expected to collect much more than Orissa or Andhra for instance.

The Working Committee has made the task easier by allotting each province to retain 75 per cent of the collection for provincial expenditure. It is to be hoped, therefore, that not a moment will be lost in organising the great memorial. It will be a fitting and noble tribute to the memory of one who gave his life to the attainment of Swaraj and died with Swaraj only in his thoughts. The Working Committee will no doubt issue authoritative instructions. * * * * We may safely follow the Punjabis' lead and show to the forthcoming All-India Congress Committee what we have done towards the fulfilment of our duty.

message of the spinning wheel. The poorest province need not feel any doubt about its ability to cope with its share of the programme. Orissa is, I believe, the poorest province. I asked the workers there whether they would shoulder their share of the burden. They agreed, nor was there any need for them to hesitate with the Lord of the Universe having his seat in Orissa. They could collect their quota, if it came to the worst, from the pilgrims who visit Puri as also from the rich Mahants and *pandas*, who, I feel sure, will gladly pay if properly approached. But our hope must centre in the pies of the poor rather than upon windfalls from single places. Nothing gave me greater confidence and greater hope than the sight of thousands of the very poor men at Sakhigopal emptying their pockets of their pies and *raisas*. The Biharis are even collecting *muthis*. With a proper depot for receiving and using such gifts, the crore rpees should be collected without any difficulty whatsoever.

I suggest workers meeting the heads of all the artisan classes. We want carpenters, blacksmiths, washermen, masons, scavengers, shoemakers, tanners, etc., to understand and take part in this movement. They do not need any previous training in schools to appreciate the necessity of Swaraj. They easily understand the intimate connection between Swaraj and the spinning wheel. With our existing caste organisations, which are really tradeguilds, we should have no difficulty in reaching the majority of the men and women who are members of these important organisations.

It should further be remembered that both men and

money are wanted for one purpose, to manufacture and distribute munitions *i. e.*, spinning wheels. We must bring about complete boycott of foreign cloth during this year and if possible before the end of July next. One crore of rupees and twenty lacs of spinning wheels is the minimum aimed at by the Congress. It does not include the spinning wheels that were already working before the 31st December last. Of coarse counts we require 6 lbs of cloth per head per year. We, therefore, need 1800 million pounds per head for the nation. In order to manufacture this quantity of cloth in a year, of say three hundred working days, and if a spindle gives $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. per day *i. e.*, 150 lbs. per year, we require 12 million spindles. What the Congress expects by the end of June is 2 million or a sixth of the total requirement. It is not an extravagant presumption to make that, if we succeed in introducing two million spinning wheels during three months the momentum received by the movement will double the number of wheels during the next three months without much effort. We have probably fifty million families in India counting six members for a family. The problem, therefore, is one of only reaching two millions out of this large number of families.

If the existing Workers have the faith that I have in the spinning wheel, they will do well to learn spinning and understand the structure of a spinning wheel so as to be able to distinguish a good wheel from a bad one. They must not on any account introduce a wheel that does not satisfy the test already suggested by me in the issue of the 6th instant. I need hardly point out that the workers will produce less impression, if any at all, if they

do not religiously eliminate foreign cloth from their wardrobe. We are not going to bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth this year, if we do not ourselves make the beginning at once and set an example. One big thing well and truly done must result in giving us confidence, hope, and courage.

A newspaper, I am told, has put the question as to what the Congress will do with its crore. The natural answer is 'for the use stated in the Congress resolution' *i.e.*, for the attainment of Swaraj through non-violent non-co-operation. The only activity involving financial obligations is that of spinning, organising national service, in some cases supporting lawyers, who might have suspended practice and cannot be included in the national service and for supporting national educational institutions. The latter three, however, really bear again on spinning. For all the workers and all the schools and colleges must be mainly occupied in promoting handspinning and hand weaving if we are to achieve a complete boycott of foreign goods before the end of the year. These are the only uses that I can conceive in connection with the All-India Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund. Seventy-five per cent of the funds are to be controlled by the provinces collecting them. And subject to the instructions framed by the All-India Congress Committee, the provinces have unfettered discretion as to their use for the attainment of Swaraj.

THE NEED OF THE HOUR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 8, 1921.)

It will be nothing short of a tragedy, if we do not fulfil the Bezwada programme before the end of the month. Seven days of the month will have gone before these notes are out. We have not a moment to spare. We have hardly collected twenty lacs of rupees as yet. To collect eighty lacs during the next three week may seem an impossibility. But the seeming impossibility can be easily turned into a possibility if we were ceaselessly to work for the collection. Twenty-one provinces, if they will respond according to their ability, can easily furnish the balance. The Bezwada programme is the most concrete ever placed before the nation. If the people are with us and if we have enough workers, one crore of rupees is a mere nothing for thirty crores of people to find, for a cause so great as that of Swaraj, and for perpetuating a memory so great as that of the Lokamanya. If they choose, the women of India can give the money out of their jewellery, the liquor drinkers can give it out of their drinks. The mill-owners, who have derived the greatest benefit from the Swadeshi movement, can find the eighty lacs in a day. The Marwadis can, without any strain on their resources, find the amount, and so could the Bhatias, the Memans, the Parsis or the Banias. They are all a prosperous community, and have before now more or less supported public movements. If they wish, the Sindhis can also find the amount. The labourers

of India could pay the whole amount, if they sacrificed one twelfth of their yearly earnings. I have consulted many friends as to the amount that can be easily paid by the respective classes mentioned by me. The following may serve as a working basis.

(1) Salaried men to pay one tenth of their monthly pay.

(2) Lawyers, doctors, merchants and such others to pay one twelfth of their nett annual income as at the end of May last.

(3) Propertied men to pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ p. c. of the valuation of their property.

(4) All the others to pay not less than four annas each.

If all were to pay according to this scale, there would be several crores of rupees. But one is aware that non-co-operators and sympathisers are drawn from all classes. No single class is so wholly non-co-operationist as to feel the personal responsibility for payment. This question of payment is the acid test of our sincerity, earnestness and capacity. Let us hope that the 30th of this month will not find us wanting.

Questions have been persistently asked as to why this large sum is required. The answer is simple. It is a profitable investment, not for purely personal, but for public good. The amount will be devoted chiefly to distributing spinning wheels and conducting national schools. We have, say, six crore of homes, if broken down families may deserve so sweet a name. We must provide these families with spinning wheels, and enable them to become real homes. One crore of rupees is surely the least amount required for establishing home-spinning on such a basis as to become self-propagating. Similarly, if we are

to reconstruct our educational system, we shall need more than one crore of rupees for the purpose.

The second question that has been asked is what security is there for honest accountancy? In the first place, we have in Messrs. Chotani and Jamnalal treasurers of unimpeachable integrity. Secondly, we have in Pandit Motilal Nehru a working secretary of great ability, experience and equally unimpeachable integrity. Thirdly we have a vigilant working committee composed of fifteen representative Indians, who meet at least once a month in order to be able to exercise effective control over Congress affairs. So much for the All-India finance. The All-India Congress Committee is directly liable for the expenditure of one-fourth of the fund. The remaining three-fourths are to be retained by the Provincial Committees for local needs. Each Province is expected to keep efficient watch over its own finance. Finally, the whole income and expenditure, both provincial and central is subject to be audited by auditors to be appointed by the All-India Congress Committee.

As with finance, so with the registration of members, and manufacture and introduction of spinning wheels. These three are simple and effective tests of our constructive capacity.

I suggest to all Congress and Khilafat workers, that they should set apart the last ten days as special Congress days to be solely devoted by them to finishing the Bezwada programme. No speeches are required, no meetings are necessary. Quiet house to house visits and personal canvassing are more effective than meeting, for the class of work before us.

THE DESTRUCTIVE PART

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 8, 1921.)

The *Leader* has blessed me with undeserved compliment for this programme, and laughed at me for having ever advised the country to adopt the destructive part of non-co-operation. A correspondent of that journal appeals to me definitely to withdraw the rest of the programme. Let me hasten to inform the *Leader* and its correspondent, that it is not possible for me to do so even if I wished. The Congress and the Central Khilafat Committee are the only bodies that possess the power. And my faith in the destructive part being as green as ever, I personally could not abandon it, even if the Congress and the Central Khilafat Committee did so. With them non-violence may not be, with one body it is not, the final creed. For me I have nothing beyond non-violence as a remedy for all ills. Therefore I cannot be party to advising lawyers to return to their practice, or students to Government schools. Nor can I be party to lawyers and Government school and college boys becoming holders of office under the Congress, so long as it retains its non-co-operationist character.

The vocal propaganda of the destructive part in the first step in non-co-operation is over. We know exactly where we are, regarding the titles, the law courts, the schools and the councils. I believe non-co-operators are satisfied that these institutions have lost their former prestige. The opponents are entitled to comfort in the knowledge that the numerical response has not been large

enough to be striking. Those that have responded to the call, constitute the most effective though silent propaganda in the direction. But one thing is clear. There can be no resumption of co-operation, till the three conditions laid down by the Congress are satisfied.

The Bezwada programme, I admit, is not in itself enough to establish Swaraj. But I do hold that it is a very substantial step towards it. The fulfilment of the programme will inspire the nation with self-confidence, and enable it to take the other steps, if necessary. One crore electors—for to become congress members is to become electors for national representatives for various bodies—is to find the nucleus for a real electorate under Swaraj. To have twenty lacs of spinning wheels in working order, is to know that India is determined to drive out poverty, to become self-reliant and to achieve her economic independence. The collection of one crore of rupees is a tangible token of the nation's determination to achieve her destiny.

We have so fed ourselves with the history of other nations, that we find it impossible to believe that we can attain our end without a repetition of thirty year's or a hundred years' war, and therefore without military training and huge armament. We do not care to read our own history and remember, that whilst kings have come and kings have gone, whilst dynasties have been formed and destroyed, India has remained unmoved and unaffected. We will not read the lesson of the late war, that it is not so much military preparation we want, as a change of our own outlook upon India's future. Habit has forced the conviction upon us, that we, the countless millions, are nothing before one hundred thousand Englishmen, not all of

whom are even administrators. As soon as we have discarded the awe of the British rule, and ceased to consider ourselves as cheap as dirt, we shall be free. I know that it is possible to perform this revolution of thought during the year, and it is my hope that India will be ready for it during the time. Hitherto we have promised ourselves many things and fulfilled little. If we were to turn up even two years old resolutions of the Congress, we shall find that we have failed even to send petitions we had resolved upon. Hitherto, we have looked up to the Government to do everything for us, and we have found it almost wholly irresponsible in everything that matters. We have therefore been filled with blank despair. We have ceased to believe in ourselves or the Government. The present movement is an attempt to change this winter of our despair into the summer of hope and confidence. When we begin to believe in ourselves. Englishmen will, I promise, begin to believe in us. Then, and not till then, is there any hope of co-operation between the Government and us. The existing system of Government, it will be found upon analysis, is based upon a scientific study of our weaknesses, which have rather been promoted by it than reduced. Non-co-operation is, therefore, as much a protest against our own weaknesses, as against the inherent corruption of the existing system. British and Indian, we become impure by belonging to it. The withdrawal from it of one party purifies both. I invite even the sceptics to follow the programme of non-co-operation as a trial, and I promise that there will be Swaraj in India during the year, if the programme is carried out in its fulness.

THE TILAK MEMORIAL FUND

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 22, 1921.)

Truly to revere the memory of a person is to achieve his life's purpose. Truly to revere the memory of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, whom India delighted and still delights to call Lokamanya, must be to establish Swaraj, and thus for ever to perpetuate his memory. How fine, how noble, if we could establish Swaraj on the anniversary of his death? Nor is it impossible to do so, during the forty days that remain at our disposal. But my sanguine temperament cannot visualise Swaraj by the first of August next. By strenuous work, it is certainly possible to establish Swaraj on the first day of October next. It must be death to the Congress, if Swaraj cannot be established on or before the 31st December next. But it cannot be, if we do not carry out our Bezwada undertaking to raise one crore of rupees. These lines will be published on the 22nd inst. The reader has therefore to think how to complete the crore in eight days.

Let us know how we stand. If all goes well, it may safely be assumed, that forty lacs will have been collected by that date outside Bombay. That means, let me further state, at least three lacs in Bengal, four in the Punjab, three in Sindh, three in Andhra, three in the C.P., four in Bihar and ten in Gujarat. That makes thirty lacs. Ten lacs for the remaining provinces is not an extravagant estimate. Let us assume, that all the Provinces but Bombay succeed in collecting all together forty lacs.

How to collect sixty lacs in and through Bombay, that is the question. If we are to reach the total of one crore before the 30th June, the amount must be raised chiefly from the available rich men of Bombay and Calcutia. *i.e.*, those who feel for the movement and believe in it.

There should be not only no bother about collecting the crore, but there should be certainty of Swaraj in a month, if all the rich men of India could realise that their safety lies, not in fearing the existing Government, but in fearlessly helping the movement. To-day, if they are making millions, they are sending billions out of the country, *i.e.* they are taking the millions and assisting to take the billions out of the mouths of their poor, and in many cases, starving countrymen. To-day, they, more than the other classes, are supporting a top-heavy administration, which is keeping up a ruinous military expenditure in order to be able to hold India in the last resort by Dyerism and O'Dwyerism.

But we must take the facts as they are. The richest men are afraid to incur the displeasure of collectors and commissioners. Some of them honestly fear the success of non-co-operation. They believe that its success means chaos and destruction of life and property at least for the time being. We must win these over by patiently persevering to impregnate the atmosphere with the spirit of non-violence in thought, word and deed.

Meanwhile, let us realise that the few rich men and women we have with us, have to sacrifice more than they are ordinarily used to, if we are to make up the deficiency. A happy beginning has already been made in Bombay. Earnest workers, themselves endowed with riches, are

working night and day to make large collections. They are meeting with ups and downs. But they are dauntlessly pursuing their even course.

We must get rid of the habit of waiting to be coaxed. Why should not the monied men of Bombay volunteer their assistance and send their gifts? Why should they wait till some one else has begun?

And what of those who cannot give lacs or thousands each? They can still do much to reduce the burden of the few rich. Let them not wait for a summons from any society. Let each group, each caste, each trade-guild automatically set about collecting and sending to the provincial centres. The remaining days must be utilized for that purpose and no other by those who have any ability for collection.

It is a shame that the total possible collection of the provinces cannot be more than forty lacs. There is still time to wipe out the reproach, by each province producing selfless workers for the Week of Grace and Privilege, who would concentrate their energies on collections.

Seeing that so many of the moneyed men are abstaining, and seeing that we have not succeeded in organising collections among the masses, it follows that some must give their all. I know four Gujaratis, themselves workers of standing and ability, who have given their all. One has died, leaving over Rs. 25,000, the whole of his saving, to the Swaraj Fund. I hope the example of the four workers will prove infectious. One loses nothing by giving in the cause of Freedom.

If we are to achieve Swaraj during this year, the least we can do is to complete the Bezwada programme by the

time fixed. The collection of the crore will be a most visible token of its fulfilment.

Membership and the Charka are no less important. I suggest two meetings, one on Sunday the 26th and the other on the 30th June at every possible village or centre, merely for the purpose of explaining the Congress creed, and inviting all of the age of twenty-one and over, men and women, to become members of any one original Congress Committee. At these meetings, no other work should be done, save that of enrolling members and collecting subscriptions for membership. Forms can also be deposited during these days at all places, where responsible men will undertake the work of canvassing.

Though we have no census of Charkhas, from all the accounts I have received, the spinning-wheel has so far penetrated the masses, that it is likely that there are already twenty lacs of spinning-wheels working more or less indifferently throughout India.

THE BEGINNIG OF RESPONSIBILITY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*July 6, 1921.*)

The unexampled response given by India to the Tilak Swaraj Fund shows the trust she has in her non-co-operation leaders. Will they prove worthy of the trust? Many have given liberally, and all have asked, how will the funds be administered? I have unhesitatingly replied, that the officers of the Provincial Congress Committees are responsible and tried men. If we do not

account properly for every pie we receive and do not make judicious use of the funds, we shall deserve to be blotted out of public life. Let us remember that the poorest people have given of their best. Many have given their all. Washermen, carpenters, blacksmiths, Christians, Jews, Parsis, Sikhs, Jains, Mussalmans and Hindus have paid their mite. On the 16th of June, when the collection commenced in Bombay, the whole amount collected throughout India stood at thirty lacs, if even at that, I had full faith that forty lacs would be collected by the end of June by the provinces other than Bombay. All India, therefore, subscribed at the rate of more than five lacs per day during the fourteen days of concentrated effort. The provinces outside Bombay had subscribed up to the 30th June during the same period as Bombay thirty-eight lacs—not a bad record. How shall we retain this confidence? * We must keep accurate accounts, which even a

* Mr Gandhi wrote thus in *Navjivan* (*Young India*, July 6, 1921) —

Our Burden—It is not enough that we have secured the crore. We should know how to make a good use of it. We should know to keep clear and complete accounts. We are not going to put the crore out at interest. We have collected it for our *immediate needs*. We have to elevate national life by means of it. We must boycott foreign cloth. We must introduce a system of national education. We must ameliorate the wretched condition of the suppressed classes. We must free the nation from the clutches of drink. We must banish for ever the spectre of famine from our country. The crore could be used up for all these things. For this, we need honest workers. Our accounts should be open for inspection even to a child. All hopes for assistance in the future must naturally depend upon a proper administration of the present trust. We have got in our collections the priceless ornaments of sinless sisters. Many girls have given up all such jewellery as was so dear to them. I know the names of some, but I do not care to publish them. They have not cared for publicity. I think them to be so holy, that I would not like to take their names in

child can see and understand. The funds ought not to be used outside the purpose of non-co-operation nor generally for any purpose outside. (1) The spread of the *Charka* and *Khadi*, (2) the removal of untouchability, and hence the elevation of the suppressed classes, (3) the conduct of national schools, where spinning and weaving are a part of the training and (4) the advance of the liquor prohibition campaign.

These objects necessarily include the upkeep of the national service. It will be through the instrumentality of that service, that we shall be able to achieve the objects above named. And to achieve the objects above named, is to demonstrate our fitness and ability for attaining Swaraj.

I would warn the different Committees against living on the interest of the funds. To invest the money at interest and to use only the interest, is to betray want of faith in the nation and in ourselves. The nation's trust must be our capital, and its response from time to time must constitute our interest. If we claim to

vain They have given only for the joy of giving One widowed sister gave me all the pearls and rubies that still remained with her My heart wept within me, as I accepted them. Are we fit recipients of gifts like these? A widow never likes to part with her ornaments, she holds them with all the greater tenacity. I put this sister on her guard. I asked her to have them back, if there was the least hesitation or bashfulness in the act of giving. She did not withdraw, she was already fully determined on the step she took. What, if we use money thus obtained negligently, foolishly or dishonestly? We should not only be disappointed in our hope of Swaraj. We should become the ever hopeless denizens of the darkest hell. I trust that the purity of these sisters—their religious fervour—will keep us on the straight path, will not allow our honour to be tarnished, and will lead to the fulfilment of all our desires and aspirations.

represent the nation, we must rely upon it to finance yearly institutions established and conducted for it. Living on interest tends to make us irresponsible. The hoards rotting in the name of religion in the various parts of India have made many of these religious institutions a sham, where they have not become hot-beds of corruption. If, therefore, we would profit by our past experience, we would spend almost the whole amount collected by us during the remaining six months. When I placed the financial programme before the All-India Congress Committee in Bezwada, I did so, because I knew that we had honest and able men enough to deal with national and provincial finance, and because we needed that amount for use during the year. We cannot achieve boycott of foreign cloth, unless we spend liberally in buying spinning-wheels, handspun yarn and *Khadi*. We must conduct the Swadeshi propaganda, till the spinning wheel has been placed on a commercial footing and has found a lasting place in every home. Distributed over a large area, the crore is not much to spend till the end of the year. I would suggest every province framing at the end of the month its own considered budget and spending not less nor more. I have suggested a month, for the provinces would hardly have made up their accounts and collected the promised subscriptions before then. Moreover, we must wait for the All-India Congress Committee to give us a definite lead for the months to follow. If we succeed in fulfilling the programme in an orderly manner, we cannot fail to establish Swaraj before December, if not by the end of September.

PART VII

Civil Disobedience

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 4, 1921.)

Civil disobedience was on the lips of every one of the members of the All-India Congress Committee.* Not having really ever tried it, everyone appeared to be enamoured of it from a mistaken belief in it as a sovereign remedy for our present day ills. I feel sure that it can be made such if we can produce the necessary atmosphere for it. For individuals, there always is that atmosphere except when their civil disobedience is certain to lead to bloodshed. I discovered this exception during the Satyagraha days. But even so a call may come which one dare not neglect, cost it what it may. I can clearly see the time coming to me when I *must* refuse obedience to every single state-made law, even though there may be a certainty of bloodshed. When neglect of the call means a denial of God, civil disobedience becomes a peremptory duty.

Mass civil disobedience stands on a different footing. It can only be tried in a calm atmosphere.

* The All India Congress Committee met at Bombay on July 28. It postponed civil disobedience but authorised the Working Committee of the Congress to sanction it in any place or province

It must be the calmness of strength not weakness, of knowledge, not ignorance. Individual civil disobedience may be and often is vicarious. Mass civil disobedience may be and often is selfish in the sense that individuals expect personal gain from their disobedience. Thus in South Africa, Kallenbach and Polak offered vicarious civil disobedience. They had nothing to gain. Thousands offered it because they expected personal gain also in the shape say of the removal of the annual poll-tax levied up on ex-indentured men and their wives and grown-up children. It is sufficient in mass civil disobedience if the resisters understand the working of the doctrine.

It was in a practically uninhabited tract of country that I was arrested in South Africa when I was marching into prohibited area with over two to three thousand men and some women. The company included several Pathans and others who were able bodied men. It was the greatest testimony of merit the Government of South Africa gave to the movement. They knew that we were as harmless as we were determined. It was easy enough for that body of men to cut to pieces those who arrested me. It would have not only been a most cowardly thing to do, but it would have been a treacherous breach of their own pledge, and it would have meant ruin to the struggle for freedom and the forcible deportation of every Indian from South Africa. But the men were no rabble. They were disciplined soldiers and all the better for being unarmed. Though I was torn from them, they did not disperse, nor did they turn back. They marched on to their destination till they were every one of them arrested and imprisoned. So far as I am aware, this was an ins-

tance of discipline and non-violence for which there is no parallel in history. Without such restraint I see no hope of successful mass civil disobedience here.

We must dismiss the idea of overawing the government by huge demonstrations every time some one is arrested. On the contrary we must treat arrest as the normal condition of the life of a non-co-operator. For we must seek arrest and imprisonment, as a soldier who goes to battle seeks death. We except to bear down the opposition of the Government by courting and by avoiding imprisonment, even though it be by showing our supposed readiness to be arrested and imprisoned *en masse*. Civil disobedience then emphatically means our desire to surrender to a single unarmed policeman. Our triumph consists in thousands being led to the prisons like lambs to the slaughter house, if the lambs of the world had been willingly led, they would have long ago saved themselves from the butcher's knife. Our triumph consists again in being imprisoned for no wrong whatsoever. The greater our innocence, the greater our strength and the swifter our victory.

As it is, this Government is cowardly, we are afraid of imprisonment. The Government takes advantages of our fear of gaols. If only our men and women welcome gaols as health-resorts, we will cease to worry about the dear ones put in gaols which our countrymen in South Africa used to nickname His Majesty's Hotels.

We have too long been mentally disobedient to the laws of the state and have too often surreptitiously evaded them, to be fit all of a sudden for civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil has to be open and non-violent.

Complete civil disobedience is a state of peaceful rebellion—a refusal to obey every single state-made law. It is certainly more dangerous than an armed rebellion. For it can never be put down if the civil resisters are prepared to face extreme hardships. It is based upon an implicit belief in the absolute efficiency of innocent suffering. By noiselessly going to prison a civil resister ensures a calm atmosphere. The wrong-doer wearies of wrongdoing in the absence of resistance. All pleasure is lost when the victim betrays no resistance. A full grasp of the conditions of successful civil resistance is necessary at least on the part of the representatives of the people before we can launch out on an enterprise of such magnitude. The quickest remedies are always fraught with the greatest danger and require the utmost skill in handling them. It is my firm conviction that if we bring about a successful boycott of foreign cloth, we shall have produced an atmosphere that would enable us to inaugurate civil disobedience on a scale that no Government can resist. I would therefore urge patience and determined concentration on Swadeshi upon those who are impatient to embark on mass civil disobedience.

THE ALI BROTHERS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 8, 1921.)

I hope that the rumour about the impending prosecution of the Brothers is untrue. If the Government really desire that the issue between them and the people should

be decided on merits and by the ripening of public opinion, they will leave the Brothers alone. I shall certainly hope, that the people will remain calm dignified and firm, in spite of their prosecution and incarceration. But their incarceration will make the task of preservation of peace more difficult than it already is. No two men have so successfully restrained the Musalmans as these two patriots have. They have, in season and out of season, in private and in public, preached and practised non-violence. And even in respect of the speeches,* some parts of which seemed to bear a contrary interpretation, I know that they never meant violence. The prosecution of the Brothers would, therefore, mean an intention to strangle the ever-growing Khilafat agitation in India, and would amount to a direct challenge to the Indian Mussalmans, and indeed, to the whole of India. For the Khilafat has become an Indian question. It is no longer merely a Mussalman grievance.

But I write this more to warn the people than the Government. If the people have understood the message of the brave Brothers, it is that they must stand the gravest provocation for the sake of their religion and country, that they must be prepared to suffer for either to the utmost, that the interests of Hindus and Mussalmans are identical and therefore they must sink or swim together, and that they must be true as steel and brave like lions and must tell the truth as they know it

* On the 8th of July the All-India Khilafat Conference met at Karachi. Among others a resolution urging Muslims not to serve the army or help or acquiesce in the recruitment. The Ali Brothers were arrested for taking part in the passing of this resolution at the conference.

even on the gallows. The greatest honour the people can do to the Brothers is to follow the non-co-operation programme to the letter and win Swaraj during this year. Anger over their incarceration, will be madness. We have dared openly to desire and to prepare for the end of the existing system of Government, and challenged its administrators to do their worst. We must neither be surprised nor angry, if they treat us seriously and take up the challenge. For they must some day or other, take us at our word and put us to the invited test, or mend in accordance with our will. We shall be committing a grievous breach of the laws of the game, if we are found wanting when we are weighed in the scales of our own make. The only prescription for non-co-operators when anyone is arrested, is to put forth redoubled zeal in the prosecution of our programme, *i. e.*, boycott of foreign cloth and manufacture in our own homes of the cloth we need. There must not be any *hartal*.

THE LAST ACT ?

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 22, 1920.)

The much talked of arrest of Maulana Mahomed Ali took place at Waltair, whilst we were on our way to Madras. I am writing this in the train, just after writing out a few telegrams. The train halted at Waltair for over twenty-five minutes. Maulana Mahomed Ali and I were going outside the station to address a meeting.

Hardly had we gone a few places from the entrance, when I heard the Maulana shouting to me and reading the notice given to him, I was a few paces in front of him. Two white men and half a dozen Indian police composed the party of arrest. The officer in charge would not let the Maulana finish reading the notice, but grasped his arm and took the Maulana away. With a smile on his lips he waved good-bye. I understood the meaning. I was to keep the flag flying. May God help me to prove worthy of the message of a comrade with whom it was a privilege to work.

I continued my journey to the meeting place. I asked the people to remain calm, and fulfil the Congress programme. I then retracted my steps, and went where the Maulana was being detained. I asked the officer in charge whether I could see the Maulana. He said he had orders to let his wife and secretary only to meet him. I saw Begum Mahomed Ali and secretary Mr. Hayat coming out of the detention room.

Waltair is a beauty spot in Andhra. It is a sanatorium. I envied the Maulana his arrest at such a lovely place. He was contemplating staying at Waltair a few days to rest and complete his accounts of the deputation. But the unexpectedly long stay in Bengal and the Moplah outbreak had rendered it impossible.

God had willed it otherwise. He wanted to give the Maulana enforced rest. And I know that he is happy in his detention.

Here is a copy of the warrant of arrest :—

" To

F E Cunningham Esq.,
Deputy Inspector General of Police.
C. I. D. and Railways, MADRAS

Whereas Mahomed Ali is to be called on to show cause why he should not be bound over to keep the peace or to be of good behaviour for a period of one year under Secs 107 and 108 Cr. P. C. You are hereby directed to arrest the said Mahomed Ali and produce him before me. Therein, fail not. Dated the 14th day of September, 1921.

(Sd) J R. HUGGINS
Dt. Magistrate, VIZAGAPATAM."

Is it not funny, that he who has not only been himself peaceful but has endeavoured, and that successfully, to ensure peace among others and who has been a pattern of good behaviour, should be called upon by an insolent power to be 'bound over to keep the peace and be of good behaviour'? A Government that is evil has no room for good men and women except in its prisons.

What has happened to the younger is bound to happen to the elder brother. They call themselves Siamese twins. They are inseparable. And if the one has misbehaved, the other undoubtedly has. I hope, that by the time this is in print, India would have learnt of the Maulana Shaukat Ali's arrest.

In imprisoning Maulana Mahomed Ali, the Government has imprisoned the Khilafat. For the two brothers are the truest representatives of the Khilafat. They cannot rest so long as the Khalifa remains practically a prisoner and their holy places virtually under non-Muslim control. The imprisonment of either or both means a flat refusal to recognise the Khilafat claim.

The Government will however find, that they have not succeeded in imprisoning the spirit of the Brothers, and

that the Khilafat struggle will rage all the fiercer, for their imprisonment. The spirit of the Brothers will live in every true Hindu and Mussalman who will keep the Khilafat flame steady and shining.

But the Brothers to-day stand for more than the Khilafat. They want Swaraj and the redress of the Punjab wrong equally with the redress of the Khilafat wrong. They are too honourable to sell themselves even for securing the redress of the Khilafat wrong. To them the three are inextricably mixed up. It cannot well be otherwise, for to grant or to get the one is to grant or to get the other.

For me the imprisonment is a good omen. The Government were playing with the thing so long as they were arresting the rank and file. Every Government that does not wish to yield to popular will is bound to arrest popular leaders and attempt to crush the popular spirit. With the Indian Government it has become the code of honour to arrest and imprison leaders and yield to popular will when there is no grace left in the giving.

The imprisonment therefore may safely be regarded as a preliminary to the establishment of Swaraj. Only the Swaraj Parliament can unlock the gaol gate, and relieve the Brothers and their fellow prisoners with becoming honours. For this is a fight to the finish.

The best tribute we can pay the Brothers and their fellow prisoners is to throw away all doubts, fears and lethargy. We have been doubtful as to the value of non-violence and Swadeshi for attainment of our goal and our ability to finish the programme within the year. We have entertained fear regarding our ability to

undergo the necessary sacrifice, and we have been prosecuting our programme lazily. Let us imitate the courage, the faith, the fearlessness, the truthfulness, and the vigilant incessant activity of the Brothers, and we shall certainly attain Swaraj. 'Therein fail not' were the concluding words of the Magistrate's order. Well, the officer in charge 'failed not'. Many an English officer, be it said to his credit, has lost his life in trying not to fail. The Congress and the Khilafat command, mandate, advice, whatever it may be called, is 'Therein fail not.' Shall we, during the remaining period of grace, so work as to be able to report to the Congress, 'we have failed not'? The orders are clear :

- (1) Be non-violent even under the greatest provocation.
- (2) Preserve Hindu Muslim unity even under the severest strain.

- (3) Boycott the use of foreign cloth, even though you may have to be satisfied with the merest loin-cloth and take to hand spinning, during every odd moment that can be spared.

When we have carried out these conditions, but not till then, are we ready to offer civil disobedience, that will compel obedience from the mightiest Government to a people's wish.

TO THE MUSSALMANS OF INDIA

(September 29, 1922.)

Dear Countrymen,

While the arrest of Maulanas Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali has touched every Indian heart, I know what it has meant to you. The brave brothers are staunch lovers of their country, but they are Mussalmans first and everything else afterwards. It must be so with every religiously minded man. The Brothers have for years past represented all that is best and noblest in Islam. No two Mussalmans have done more than they to raise the status of Islam in India. They have promoted the cause of the Khilafat as no two other Mussalmans of India have. For they have been true, and they dared to tell what they felt even in their internment in Chindwada. Their long internment did not demoralise or weaken them. They came out just as brave as they went in.

And since their release from internment, they have shown themselves true nationalists, and you have taken pride in their being so.

The Brothers have by their simplicity, humility and inexhaustible energy fired the imagination of the masses as no other Mussalman has.

All these qualities have endeared them to you. You regard them as your ideal men. You are therefore sorry for their separation from you. Many besides you miss their genial presence. For me, they had become inseparable. I seem to be without my arms. For anything connected with Mussalmans, Shaukat Ali was my guide and friend. He never

once misled me. His judgment was sound and unerring in most cases. With the Brothers among us I felt safe about Hindu-Muslim unity, the value of which they understood as few of us have.

But whilst we all miss them, we must not give way to grief or dejection. We must learn, each one of us, to stand alone. God only is our infallible and eternal guide.

To be dejected is not only not to have known the Brothers, but it is, if I may venture to say so, not to know what religion is.

For do we not learn in all religions, that the spirit of the dear ones abides with us even when they physically leave us? Not only is the spirit of the Brothers with us, but they are serving better by their suffering, than if they were in our midst giving us some of their own courage, hope and energy. The secret of non-violence and non-co-operation lies in our realising that it is through suffering that we are to attain our goal. What is the renunciation of titles, councils, law courts and schools but a measure (very slight indeed) of suffering? That preliminary renunciation is a prelude to the larger suffering-the hardships of a gaol life and even the final consummation on the gallows if need be. The more we suffer, and the more of us suffer the nearer we are to our cherished goal.

The earlier and the more clearly we recognise, that it is not big meetings and demonstrations that would give us victory, but quiet suffering, the earlier and more certain will be our victory.

I have made your cause my own, because I believe it to be just. Khilafat, I have understood from your best men, is an ideal. You are not fighting to sustain any

wrong or even misrule. You are backing the Turks, because they represent the gentlemen of Europe, and because the European and especially the English prejudice against them is due, not to the Turks being worse than others as men, but to their being Mussalmans and not assimilating the modern spirit of exploitation of weaker people and their lands. In fighting for the Turks, you are fighting to raise the dignity and the purity of your own faith.

You have naturally therefore chosen pure methods to attain your end. It cannot be denied, that both Mussalmans and Hindus have lost much in moral stamina. Both of us have become poor representatives of our respective faiths. Instead of each one of us becoming a true child of God, we expect others to live our religion and even to die for us. But we have now chosen a method that compels us to turn, each one of us, our face towards God. Non-cooperation presumes that our opponents with whom we non-co-operate resorts to methods which are as questionable as the purpose he seeks to fulfil by such methods. We shall therefore find favour in the sight of God only by choosing methods which are different in kind from those of our opponents. This is a big claim we have made for ourselves, and we can attain success within the short time appointed by us, only if our methods are in reality radically different from those of the Government.

Hence the foundation of our movement rests on complete non-violence, whereas violence is the final refuge of the Government. And as no energy can be created without resistance, our non-resistance to Government violence

must bring the latter to a standstill. But our non-violence to be true, must be in word, thought and deed. It makes no difference that with you non-violence is an expedient. Whilst it lasts, you cannot consistently with your pledge harbour designs of violence. On the contrary we must have implicit faith in our programme of non-violence, which presupposes perfect accord between thought word and deed. I would like every Mussalman to realise, whilst the occasion for anger is the greatest, that by non-violence alone can we gain complete victory even during this year.

Nor is non-violence a visionary programme. Just imagine what the nited resolve of seven crores of Mussalmans (not to count the Hindus) must mean. Should we not have succeeded already, if all the titled men had given up their titles, all the lawyers had suspended their practice and all the students had left their schools and all had boycotted councils? But we must recognise, that with many of us the flesh has proved too weak. Seven crores are called Mussalmans and twenty-two crores are called Hindus, but only a few are true Mussalmans or true Hindus. Therefore if we have not gained our objective, the cause lies within us. And if ours is, as we claim it is, a religious struggle, we dare not become impatient save with ourselves, not even with one another.

The brothers, I am satisfied, are as innocent as I claim I am, of incitement to violence. Theirs, therefore, is a spotless offering. They have done all in their power for Islam and their country. Now, if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are not redressed and Swaraj is not established during this year the fault will be yours and mine.

We must remain non-violent, but we must not be passive. We must repeat the formula of the Brothers regarding the duty of soldiers and invite imprisonment. We need not think that the struggle cannot go on without even the best of us. If it cannot, we are neither fit for Swaraj nor for redressing the Khilafat or the Punjab wrong. We must declare from a thousand platforms that it is sinful for any Mussalman or Hindu to serve the existing Government whether as soldier or in any other capacity whatsoever.

Above all we must concentrate on complete boycott of foreign cloth, whether British, Japanese, American, French or any other and begin, if we have not already done so, to introduce spinning wheels and hand looms in our homes and manufacture all the cloth we need. This will be at once a test of our belief in non-violence for our country's freedom and for saving the Khilafat. It will be a test also of Hindu-Muslim unity, and it will be a universal test of our faith in our own programme. I repeat my conviction that we can achieve our full purpose within one month of a complete boycott of foreign cloth. For we are then in a position having confidence in our ability to control forces of violence, to offer civil disobedience, if it is at all found necessary.

I can therefore find no balm for the deep wounds inflicted upon you by the Government other than non-violence translated into action by boycott of foreign cloth and manufacture of cloth in our own homes.

Madura,
24th Sept. 1921.

I am,
Your friend and comrade,
M. K. Gandhi.

A MANIFESTO

(October 6, 1921.)

In view of the prosecution of the Ali brothers and others for the reasons stated in the Government of Bombay Communique dated the 15th September, 1921, we, the undersigned, speaking in our individual capacity, desire to state that it is the inherent right of every one to express his opinion * without restraint about the propriety of citizens offering their services to, or remaining in the employ of, the Government, whether in the civil or the military department.

* Mr. Gandhi in *Young India* of October 6, 1921 writes —

Expression of Opinion.—When in any movement violence is religiously eschewed, it becomes a propaganda movement of the purest type. Any attempt to crush it is an attempt to crush public opinion. And such the present repression has become. Why should I not express my profound conviction, [1] that it is sinful to serve the Government in any capacity whatsoever, especially that of a soldier,

[2] that it is sinful to drink intoxicating liquors,

[3] that it is sinful to wear foreign cloth,

[4] that it is sinful to gamble or speculate in foodstuffs or cotton?

The Government may, as it is carrying on a counter propaganda, successfully draw recruits for civil and military employment, by various methods induce people to drink and wear foreign cloth and speculate in foodstuffs and cotton, and thus continue to govern so long as people intentionally or ignorantly co-operate with it. It will fall the day the people are convinced to the contrary. And just as I carry on my propaganda among the wine bibbers and the cotton speculators to wean them from their evil ways, I claim the right to tell the soldier face to face what is his duty in accordance with my opinion. Why should the soldier be kept in ignorance of what is going on in the country? Is the Government afraid, that if he comes to know the truth, he will no longer serve it? A Government worth the name should be able fully to educate the soldiery and hold its loyalty. But in India everything is armed,—peace, loyalty

We, the undersigned, state it as our opinion, that it is contrary to national dignity for any Indian to serve as a civilian, and more especially as a soldier, under a system of Government, which has brought about India's economic, moral and political degradation and which has used the soldiery and the police for repressing national aspirations, as, for instance, at the time of the Rowlatt Act agitation, and which has used the soldiers for crushing the liberty of the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Turks and other nations who have done no harm to India.

We are also of opinion, that it is the duty of every Indian soldier and civilian to sever his connection with the Government and find some other means of livelihood.†

(The manifesto is signed by Mr. Gandhi and 50 others.)

and opinion Only the people are disarmed. Our duty therefore is clear. We must claim, even though it be on the gallows, to hold and openly to express any opinion we choose, so long as we do not directly or indirectly cause violence. That is the battle of non-violent non-co-operation. It must be fought to the finish. I warn the public, that the prosecution for 'tampering with the loyalty of the army' is but the precursor of prosecutions for tampering with the loyalty of the people to foreign cloth. What was the burning of the *Khadi* vests and caps of the young men of Calcut? What is the crusade against the students of the Vizagapatam Medical School, if it is not an insensate crusade against *Khadi*?

† Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of October 20, 1921 —

Telegrams and letters have poured in upon me from Deshabandhu Das downwards authorising me to insert their signatures to the manifesto on the Karachi resolution. I am not announcing all the names, because I hold it to be unnecessary. It was a demonstration to show the Government that the Mussalman divines were not the only ones who held it sinful to serve the present Government, and the Ali Brothers and their co-accused were not the only persons to approve of the Karachi resolution. The others will sign the manifesto, if the Government will graciously honour the signatories with arrest and imprisonment.

THE ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 10, 1921.)

The present All India Congress Committee met for the last time at Delhi on the 4th November.....

The resolution of the session was, however, the one on civil disobedience which I give below :—

Whereas there is not much over one month for the fulfilment of the national determination to establish Swaraj before the end of the year, and whereas the nation has demonstrated its capacity for exemplary self-restraint by observing perfect non-violence over the arrest and imprisonment of the Ali Brothers and the other leaders, and whereas it is desirable for the nation to demonstrate its capacity for further suffering and discipline, discipline sufficient for the attainment of Swaraj, the All-India Congress Committee authorises every province, on its own responsibility to undertake civil disobedience including non-payment of taxes in the manner that may be considered the most suitable by the respective Provincial Congress Committees subject to the following conditions.—

(1) In the event of individual civil disobedience, the individual must know hand spinning, and must have completely fulfilled that part of the programme which is applicable to him or her, e.g. he or she must have entirely discarded the use of foreign cloth and adopted only handspun and hand-woven garments, must be a believer in Hindu-Muslim unity and in the unity amongst all the communities professing different religions in India as an article of faith, must believe in non-violence as absolutely essential for the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swaraj, and if a Hindu, must by his personal conduct show that he regards untouchability as a blot upon nationalism.

(2) In the event of mass civil disobedience, a District or Tehsil should be treated as a unit, and therein a vast majority of the population must have adopted full Swadeshi and must be clothed out of cloth handspun and hand woven in that District or Tehsil, and must believe in and practise all the other items of non-co-operation.

Provided that no civil resister should expect to be supported out of public funds, and members of the families of civil resisters undergoing

sentence will be expected to support themselves by carding, hand spinning, and hand weaving or any other means :

Provided further that upon application by any Provincial Congress Committee, it is open to the Working Committee to relax the conditions of civil disobedience, if it is satisfied that any conditions should be waived.

Those who were eager to start civil disobedience immediately brought forward a series of amendments which they supported with considerable skill, and yet the speeches were models of brevity. Every one of the amendments was rejected after the fullest discussion. The chief debater was Maulana Hasrat Mohani, who being impatient for civil disobedience could not understand the imposition of the tests laid down for would-be civil resisters. One and only one addition was accepted at the instance of the Sikh delegates. They are most sensitive about their special rights. If, therefore, Hindu-Muslim unity was maintained, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh unity in the Punjab must also be insisted upon. 'Then why not mention the others?' was the burden of other speeches. The result was, that 'unity among all the communities professing other religions' was added. It is a wise addition, for it shows that Hindu-Moslem unity is not a menace but it is a symbol of unity among all.

Whilst, therefore, there is perfect unanimity in the Committee, it would be wrong to suppose that there is no obstruction or opposition in the Committee. The Maharashtra party is a capable and drilled body. It has adopted the programme more from loyalty to the Congress and the rule of majority than from deep conviction. It is giving a trial to a programme in which it has not implicit faith. It makes its presence felt by mild obstruction. But it is too patriotic to carry

obstruction to the point of destruction. Mr. Abhyankar fortifies it by his sledge-hammer oratory. Mr. Ane supports it by his calm logic. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta is the freelance of the party. He effectively uses the Committee for developing his debating skill and obstructive tactics. The Committee refuses to treat him seriously and he lets you know that he does not expect to be treated seriously. The house laughs at his expense and he heartily joins in it. He enlivened the proceedings at the outset by proposing himself to the chair if no other member would allow himself to be proposed in the place of a member of the Working Committee. He considers the members of the Working Committee to be all honourable men, and the measure of the honour is, that they are constantly in his opinion arrogating to themselves rights they do not possess. The reader however, must not think that all this is done with any poison in the performance. I have not known a better behaved or more good-humoured assembly. And I regard the Maharashtra party to be an acquisition of which any nation would feel proud. Indeed I refer to the party to emphasise my contention that the Committee is composed of men who know their minds and who are determined to give a good account of themselves in their effort to win India's freedom.

THE MOMENTOUS ISSUE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 10, 1921.)

The next few weeks should see civil disobedience in full working order in some part of India. With illustrations of partial and individual civil disobedience the country has become familiar. Complete civil disobedience is rebellion without the element of violence in it. An out and out civil resister simply ignores the authority of the state. He becomes an outlaw claiming to disregard every unmoral state law. Thus, for instance, he may refuse to pay taxes, he may refuse to recognise the authority of the state in his daily intercourse. He may refuse to obey the law of trespass and claim to enter military barracks in order to speak to the soldiers, he may refuse to submit to limitations upon the manner of picketing and may picket within the prescribed area. In doing all this he never uses force and never resists force when it is used against him. In fact, he invites imprisonment and other uses of force against himself. This he does because and when he finds the bodily freedom he seemingly enjoys to be an intolerable burden. He argues to himself, that a state allows personal freedom only in so far as the citizen submits to its regulations. Submission to the state law is the price a citizen pays for his personal liberty. Submission, therefore, to a state wholly or largely unjust is an immoral barter for liberty. A citizen who thus realises the evil nature of a state is not satisfied to live on its sufferance, and therefore appears to the others who do not

share his belief to be a nuisance to society whilst he is endeavouring to compel the state without committing a moral breach to arrest him. Thus considered, civil resistance is a most powerful expression of a soul's anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil state. Is not this the history of all reform? Have not reformers, much to the disgust of their fellows, discarded even innocent symbols associated with an evil practice?

When a body of men disown the state under which they have hitherto lived, they nearly establish their own government. I say nearly, for they do not go to the point of using force when they are resisted by the state. Their 'business' of the individual is to be locked up or shot by the state, unless it recognises their separate existence, in other words, bows to their will. Thus three thousand Indians in South Africa after due notice to the Government of the Transvaal crossed the Transvaal border in 1914 in defiance of the Transvaal immigration law and compelled the Government to arrest them. When it failed to provoke them to violence or to coerce them into submission, it yielded to their demand. A body of civil resisters is therefore, like an army subject to all the discipline of a soldier, only harder because of want of excitement of an ordinary soldier's life. And as a civil resistance army is or ought to be free from passion because free from the spirit of retaliation, it requires the fewest number of soldiers. Indeed one PERFECT civil resister is enough to win the battle of Right against Wrong.

Though, therefore, the All-India Congress Committee has authorised civil disobedience by Provincial Congress

Committees on their own responsibility, I hope they will put due emphasis on the word 'responsibility' and not start civil disobedience with a light heart. Every condition must be given its full effect. The mention of Hindu-Muslim unity, non-violence, swadeshi and removal of untouchability means that they have not yet become an integral part of our national life. If an individual or a mass have still misgivings about Hindu-Muslim unity, if they have still any doubt about the necessity of non-violence for the attainment of our triple goal, if they have not yet enforced swadeshi in its completeness, if the Hindus among that mass have still the poison of untouchability in them, that mass or that individual are not ready for civil disobedience. Indeed it would be best to watch and wait whilst the experiment is being carried on in one area. Reverting to the analogy of the army, those divisions that watch and wait are just as much co-operating actively as the division that is actually fighting. The only time, whilst the experiment is going on, that individual civil disobedience may be resorted to simultaneously, is when the Government obstruct even the silent prosecution of swadeshi. Thus if an order of prohibition is served upon an expert spinner going to teach or organise spinning, that order should be summarily disregarded and the teacher should court imprisonment. But in all other respects, in so far as I can judge at present, it will be best for every other part of India scrupulously to respect all orders and instructions whilst one part is deliberately taking the offensive and committing a deliberate breach of all the unmoral state laws it possibly can. Needless to add that any outbreak of violence in any other part of

India must necessarily injure and may even stop the experiment. The other parts will be expected to remain immovable and unperturbed, even though the people within the area of experiment may be imprisoned, riddled with bullets or otherwise ill-treated by the authorities. We must expect them to give a good account of themselves in every conceivable circumstance.

DESHABANDHU DAS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 15, 1921.)

Lord Reading has been as good as his word.* The highest in the land has not been immune from arrest. Lord Ronaldshay had perhaps given the public to understand that he would not be arrested till after the Congress and then too if he did not behave himself. But Lord Reading's threat was later than, and therefore cancelled, the implied opinion of Lord Ronaldshay. Why should the President elect be left free if he enlisted volunteers and issued manifestos? There was no cessation in the activity for bringing about *hartal* on the day of the Prince's arrival in Calcutta. It was some such reasoning, I suppose, that was applied in effecting the arrest of the President elect.

* On the 19th November 1921, the Bengal Government declared the Congress and Khilafat Volunteer Corps unlawful. But the non-co-operation leaders issued a manifesto declaring that these corps have not interfered with the maintenance of law and order and as a challenge enrolled themselves as volunteers. The Government began to arrest the volunteers including the leaders also. Similar notifications were also issued by the Government of some other provinces.

His arrest was accompanied by that of other prominent workers. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad one of the most learned among Mussalman divines, Maulvi Akramkhan, the Secretary of the Khilafat Committee, Mr. Sasmal, Secretary of the Provincial Congress Committee and Mr. Padmaraj Jain, who exercised influence over the Marwadis, were arrested with the President elect. This must be obviously to prevent *hartal*. These arrests meant that the authorities do not want to tolerate even quiet persuasion and canvassing. They want in fact a forcible opening of shops. They will not adopt the way of Colonel Johnson and threaten to open the shops and put soldiers in charge, but they wish to influence the timid shopkeepers by arresting their leaders. The merchants of Calcutta have now a chance of showing their determination and independence by observing complete *hartal* in spite of the withdrawal of leaders. It is more necessary than ever for the people now to observe *hartal* on the 24th. The idea of making a demonstration has now become a subsidiary object. The honour of their leaders requires the people of Calcutta to observe a complete *hartal*. It will be a proof of their confidence in their leaders and proof also of the exercise of their own free will. I am hoping that the people of Calcutta will not fail to do their obvious duty on the 24th instant. And now that their leaders are withdrawn from them, every non-co-operator will constitute himself a leader for keeping the peace. They cannot do better than simply keep themselves at home on the 24th except volunteers whose duty it will be to protect from harm those who may choose to open their shops. I assume that both the

Congress and the Khilafat Committees have elected fresh office-bearers. Our true test is certainly now. The assumption of leadership to-day is like the assumption of Lord Mayorship by the late MacSwiney. It carries with it the liability for immediate imprisonment. If the nation is truly awakened, there should be a ceaseless flow of leaders and men and women to be led. Our supply must always be equal to the demand made upon us by the Government. We win when we have established sufficient credit for ourselves for being able to cope with the demand.

Let there be no doubt about the propriety of us all going to gaol. If we are unable to meet the demand, let us be men enough to own that we are in a minority, and if we have faith in our programme we must turn that minority into a majority not by preaching but by living up to our preaching. Let us *realise* the full force of the truth that an ounce of practice is worth tons of preaching. It is true economy to use all the resources we have instead of wasting time in acquiring fresh resources. The latter will come as we use what we have. Supposing however that we get no further response, let us rest assured that those who refuse to go to goal will find out their own way of work. It will be at least sincere. That part of India which believes in non-co-operation by suffering will have done its full share. If we go to goal fifty times and get no addition to our numbers, I hope still to be able to say, 'We must repeat the performance till we have impressed the whole of India with the truth of our way.' That is the way of religion and no other. We want Swaraj for men who love and

would suffer freedom. We want to support the Khilafat through such men, for they only are true Hindus, true Mussalmans and true Sikhs.

To understand the simplicity of our programme is to realise its true beauty. There is nothing more to be done but to spin and court imprisonment, and spin even in the prisons if they will let us. Whilst we are spinning or going to gaol we must retain the correct attitude of mind *i. e.*, of non-violence and friendliness between the various faiths. If we cease to hate Englishmen, co-operators and those who do not see eye to eye with us, if we cease to distrust or fear one another and if we are determined to suffer and work for the bread of the whole nation *i. e.*, spin, do we not see that no power upon earth can withstand us? And if we believe in ourselves what matters it whether we are few or many, or whether we are arrested or shot? And surely in all I have said, I have presented a programme not for perfect men but for practical men who are good, true and brave. If we cannot even become good, true and brave, have we any right to talk of Swaraj or religion? Can we call ourselves Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians, Jews, Sikhs, Parsis? Have we any business if we are not that, to be talking of Khilafat and the Punjab?

Therefore if we believe in our programme, we must not mind if the Government non-co-operate with us in every particular. I hear from Mr. Rajagopalachari and Agha Safdar that they are not permitted to send full telegrams. It is a surprise to me, that they permit the transmission of any telegrams at all or let us travel or meet each other. Having made up my mind to expect the

worst, nothing that the Government does in the shape of curbing our activity surprises or irritates me. It is struggling for its very existence and I feel that I would have done much the same that this Government is doing if I was in its place. Probably I should do much worse. Why should we expect it to refrain from using the powers it has? Only we must find the means of living and carrying on our non-co-operation without its aid. We must keep our heads even if inter-provincial communication is denied to us. Having got our programme each province must be able to carry on its own activity. Indeed it may even be an advantage, for in the event of communication being cut off, we should be unaffected by reverses in other provinces. Thus for instance the Punjab need not be affected by Gujarat weakening and surrendering body and soul to the Government or say Assam going stark mad or becoming unexpectedly violent. Let not the reader fear any such possibility, for Assam is keeping exceptionally sane in spite of grave provocation and Gujarat will give, I hope, a good account of itself in the near future. The Government of Bombay probably knows its business better than others. It has certainly greater forbearance and tact. It is giving the non-co-operators as long a rope as they want. And as the latter do want to be hanged if they do not get what they want, they are taking the longest rope. But that is by the way. Clouds no bigger than a man's hand have a knack of appearing in the Indian horizon and all of a sudden assuming dangerous dimensions. The point I wish to drive home is, that we must prepare ourselves

against and for all complications and never be baffled by them, certainly never be taken aback when the expected happens.

If the luxury of wires be denied to us, we must manage with the post. If the postal communication be also stopped we must use messengers. Friends travelling to and fro will oblige us. When the use of the railways is denied, we must use other methods of conveyance. No amount of slowness imposed from without can checkmate us, if we are sure within rock of ages cleft for me let me hide. We should be unaffected by reverses in others, 'myself in thee' is a prayer common to all religions. If we can but throw ourselves into His lap as our only Help, we shall come out scartheless through every ordeal that the Government may subject us to. If nothing happens without His permitting, where is the difficulty in believing that He is trying us even through this Government? I would take our complaints to Him and be angry with Him for so cruelly trying us. And He will soothe us and forgive us, if we will but trust Him. The way to stand erect before the tyrant is not to hate him, not to strike him but to humble ourselves before God and cry out to Him in the hour of our agony.

Bengal's duty is clear. It has to return a fitting answer to the arrest of the President-elect and other chosen leaders. The arrest of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad is an event of importance equal with the arrest of the President-elect. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has an all-India reputation especially among the Mussalmans. He is a seasoned soldier having been interned for years in Ranchi. He stands high in the ranks of the learned men of Islam.

His arrest must sink deep in the hearts of the Musalmans of India. What answer will the Hindus and Musalmans of Bengal return? Action can only be answered by counter-action. We know what the answer should be. Will the thousands of Bengali Hindus and Bengali Mussalmans enrol themselves as volunteers and be arrested? Will Bengal wear only *Khadi* or nothing? Will Bengali students give the answer that the President of the Congress expected from them in his moving appeal?

I take it for granted that the Hindus and Mussalmans of Calcutta in particular and Bengal in general will keep absolutely quiet. If the present calm is an index for the future the evil done by Bombay has been almost entirely undone. The lesson of Bombay has gone home. It must abide for all time. Let the young men of Calcutta rally round the leaders who are left. Let them not be impatient. Let them keep their heads cool and their hands on the spinning wheel. Every non-co-operator must find himself and herself on the register of volunteers, and the list should be day after day published in the Press so as to make it easy for the Government to arrest whomsoever they choose. The splendid emotion of Bengal should be translated at this supreme juncture in our national history into cool energy of the highest order. No bluster, no fuss, no bravado. Only religious devotion to the cause and a fixed determination to do or die.

ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 22, 1921.)

The pages of *Young India* are rarely occupied with an examination of what rulers think. It is an idle speculation. But as the papers are discussing, advising and debating upon such a conference, I have considered it appropriate to devote some space to an examination of the mentality of the chief actor in the drama now being played in India. In my opinion such a conference is bound to prove abortive till Lord Reading is disabused of the idea that non-co-operation is confined to a few misguided zealots. If he wants co-operation and contentment he must placate non-co-operators. He must see that non-co-operation is not the disease, it is the chief symptom of a disease. The disease consists in a triple injury to the people of India. And no pallative will soothe the patient so long as the centre of the disease is not tackled. Outside the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and grant of Swaraj in accordance with a scheme framed by the chosen representatives of the people, repression is the easiest and the shortest way to a settlement. No Viceroy can, I freely confess, possibly allow things to drift. I admit that he must suppress civil disobedience as he would an armed rebellion unless he is prepared to remedy the evil towards which the disobedience is directed. Abstract truth has no value unless it incarnates in human beings who represent it by proving their readiness to die for it. Our wrongs live because we only pretend to be their livin

representative. The only way we can prove our claim is by readiness to suffer in the discharge of our trust. We are on a fair way to proving ourselves worthy of it. But I hardly think we can yet claim to have given conclusive proof. Who knows if we shall not be found wanting when imprisonment weans utter discomfort and even lashes ? Who knows how many of us are ready to mount the gallows ?

In my opinion therefore a conference at which the Government is represented will be useful only when the latter has tried the non-co-operators to its satisfaction and measured their strength in quantity and quality.

But since non-co-operation is a method of cultivating public opinion, I would certainly welcome a conference of 'co-operators and non-co-operators. I am sure that they want the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs redressed I am aware that they want freedom for the country as much as non-co-operators. It has given me much pleasure to see almost every moderate journal condemning the present repressive policy of the Government. I had expected nothing less. And I know that if non-co-operators keep self-restraint, do not become violent, do not abuse their opponents, every liberal will become a non-co-operator. Indeed even Englishmen will veer round to the non-co-operators and the Government will, as it then must capitulate. That is the expected and intended working of the method of non-co-operation. It reduces friction to a minimum. And if to-day it seems to have produced a contrary effect, it is because non-co-operators have only now begun to see that it is not enough to have been fairly non-violent in deed. It is

equally necessary to be non-violent in word and thought. It is unlawful for a non-co-operator even to wish ill to his enemies. What our opponents dread most is undisciplined violence breaking out under cover of non-violence. They do not believe in our sincerity, *i. e.*, of the vast majority of us. They see in it nothing but chaos and perdition. This repression therefore has come as a blessing in disguise. It is showing them and us that we have acquired influence over the populace to keep it under check even under provoking circumstances. Our restraint has not yet been tried long enough to be considered permanent. We are still in a state of uncertainty. The people in Sialkot did stray away from the line, be it ever so slightly. We have had so many such little jerks that we do not possess the sense of security required to inspire an outsider's faith in the movement. I would therefore welcome every opportunity of meeting the co-operators on neutral ground or for showing the *bona fides* of non-co-operators. The Government has shown itself in true colours by declaring its intention to suppress non-co-operation as such. It was on safe ground so long as it sought to put down violence or incitement to or approval of it. I have therefore no doubt that the co-operators will rise to a man against the Government madness—this vain attempt to stifle expression of opinion and agitation for redress of grievances. But I warn our friends against entertaining the idea of a conference with the Government till they find that it is truly penitent and means to appreciate the popular side. Let there be no conference on the boycott of welcome or the right of holding public meetings or forming

associations of volunteers or others so long as they have no violent purpose. Boycott of the welcome will and must continue so long as the people's wishes are flouted, and public meetings and associations are elementary rights on which there can be no parleying. We must fight for them.

Let it be understood that non-co-operators are not offering civil disobedience that they had intended to. Their insistence on calling and attending public meetings and forming peaceful volunteer associations ought not to be dignified by the name of civil dis-obedience. Non-co-operators are merely on the defensive. They have not taken, as they certainly intend to take, the offensive as soon as they are fairly certain of non-violent atmosphere. The Government has obliged them by anticipating them and providing them with a test of their own capacity.

THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE

(December 22, 1921.)

Referring to Lord Ronaldshay's speech at the Bengal Legislative Council on Monday last, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement to the correspondent of the Associated Press at his Ashram late in the night :

I have read Lord Ronaldshay's speech in the Bengal Legislative Council. Whilst I appreciate the note of conciliation about it, I cannot help saying that it is most misleading I do not want to criticise those parts of the speech, which lend themselves to criticism, I simply want to say that the present situation is entirely his own and the

Viceroy's doing. In spite of my strong desire to avoid suspecting the Government of India and the Local Governments of a wish to precipitate a conflict with the people, up to now all that I have heard and read leads me to the conclusion that my suspicion is justified. Whilst I do not wish to deny the existence of some sort of pressure, even intimidation, on the part of individuals, I do wish emphatically to deny that in connection with the phenomenal *hartal* on the 17th November in Calcutta, there was any intimidation, organised or initiated by or on behalf of the Local Congress or the Khilafat Committees. On the contrary, I am certain that the influence exerted by both these bodies was in the direction of avoiding all intimidation. Moral pressure there certainly was and will always be in all big movements, but it must be clear to the simplest understanding that a complete *hartal* such as Calcutta witnessed on the 17th November would be an impossibility by mere intimidation. But assume that there was intimidation. Was there any reason for disbanding Volunteer Corps, prohibiting public meetings and enforcing laws which are under promise of repeal? Why has no attempt been made to prove a single case of intimidation? It grieves me to have to say that the Governor of Bengal has brought in the discovery of swords or sword-sticks in one place in Calcutta to discredit large public organisations. Who intimidated the people into observing a complete *hartal* in Allahabad after all the leaders were arrested and in spite of the reported undue official pressure that was exercised upon shopkeepers and ghariwallas at that place? Again His Lordship says, "If we are to assume that this deve-

lopment means there is genuine desire to bring about improvement, there must be favourable atmosphere. In other words, it will be generally agreed that truce must be an essential preliminary to any possible conference. If responsible leaders of non-co-operation now come forward with definite assurance that this is the correct interpretation, I should then say we were in sight of such a change of circumstances as would justify Government in reconsidering the position. But words must be backed by deeds. If I were satisfied only that there was a general desire for the conference and that responsible non-co-operation leaders were prepared to take action, then I should be prepared to recommend my Government to take steps in consonance with the altered situation." This is highly misleading. If wherever words "non-co-operation leaders" occur, the word "Government" were put in and if the whole of the statement came from a non-co-operator, it would represent the correct situation. Non-co operators have really to do nothing, for they have precipitated nothing. They are over-cautious. The disturbance in Bombay was allowed to override their keen desire to take up aggressive Civil Disobedience but in the present circumstances the phrase "Civil Disobedience" is really a misnomer. What non-co-operators are doing to-day, I claim, every co-operator would do to-morrow under similar circumstances. When the Government of India or the Local Governments attempt to make our political existence or agitation, no matter how peaceful, an utter impossibility, may we not resist such attempt by every lawful means at our disposal? I cannot imagine anything more lawful or more natural than that we should

continue our volunteer organisations purging them of every tendency to become violent and continue also to hold public meetings taking the consequences of such a step. Is it not proof of the law-abiding instinct of hundreds of young men and old men that they have meekly, without offering any defence and without complaining, accepted imprisonment for having dared to exercise their elementary rights in the face of Government persecution? And so it is the Government which is to prove its genuine desire for a conference and an ultimate settlement. It is the Government which has to arrest the fatal course along which repression is taking it. It is the Government that is to prove to non-co-operators its *bona fides* before it can expect them to take part in any conference. When the Government does that, it will find that there is an absolutely peaceful atmosphere. Non-co-operation, when the Government is not resisting anything except violence, is a most harmless thing. There is really nothing for us to suspend. We cannot be expected, until there is actual settlement or guarantee of settlement, to ask schoolboys to return to Government schools or lawyers to resume practice or public men to become candidates for the Councils or title-holders to ask for return of titles. In the nature of things, it is therefore clear that non-co-operators have to do nothing. Speaking personally I can certainly say that if there is a genuine desire for a conference, I would be the last person to advise precipitating aggressive Civil Disobedience, which certainly it is my intention to do immediately. I am entirely satisfied that the people have understood the secret of non-violence; and let me say the last ten

days' events have shown that the people seem clearly to understand its inestimable value. If then the Government recognises that non-co-operators mean business and intend to suffer limitlessly for the attainment of their goal, let the Government unconditionally retrace its steps, cancel the notifications about disbandment of volunteer organisations and prohibition of public meetings and release all those men in the different provinces who have been arrested and sentenced for so-called Civil Disobedience or for any other purpose given under the definition of non-co-operation but excluding acts of violence, actual or intended. Let the Government come down with a heavy hand on every act of violence or incitement to it, but we must claim the right for all time of expressing our opinions freely and educating public opinion by every legitimate and non-violent means. It is therefore the Government who have really to undo the grave wrong they have perpetrated and they can have the conference they wish in a favourable atmosphere. Let me also say that so far as I am concerned I want no conference to consider the ways and means of dealing with non-co-operation. The only conference that can at all avail at this stage is a conference called to deal with the causes of the present discontent, namely the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and Swaraj. Any conference again which can usefully sit at the present stage must be a conference that it is really representative and not a conference to which only those whom the Government desire are invited.

THE VICEROY'S REPLY

(January 19, 1922.)

Interviewed by Associated Press correspondent, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement regarding Lord Reading's speech at Calcutta in reply to the deputation led by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya :—

I must confess that I have read the Viceregal utterance with deep pain. I was totally unprepared for what I must respectfully call his mischievous misrepresentation of the attitude of the Congress and the Khilafat organisations in connection with the visit of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. Every resolution passed by either organisation and every speaker has laid the greatest stress upon the fact that there was no question of showing the slightest ill-will against the Prince or exposing him to any affront. The boycott was purely a question of principle and directed against what we have held to be the unscrupulous methods of the bureaucracy. I have always held, as I hold even now, that the Prince has been brought to India in order to strengthen the hold of the Civil Service corporation which has brought India into a state of abject pauperism and political serfdom. If I am proved to be wrong in my supposition that the visit has that sinister meaning, I shall gladly apologise.

It is equally unfortunate for the Viceroy to say that the boycott of the welcome means an affront to the British people. His Excellency does not realise what grievous wrong he is doing to his own people by confusing them with the British administrators in India.

Does he wish India to infer that the British administrators here represent the British people and that agitation directed against their methods is an agitation against the British people? And if such is the Viceregal contention and if to conduct a vigorous and effective agitation against the methods of bureaucracy and to describe them in their true colours is an affront to the British people, then I am afraid I must plead guilty. But then I must also say in all humility, the Viceroy has entirely misread and misunderstood the great national awakening that is taking place in India. I repeat for the thousandth time that it is not hostile to any nation or any body of men, but it is deliberately aimed at the system under which the Government of India is being to-day conducted, and I promise that no threat and no enforcement of threats by the Viceroy or any body of men will strangle that agitation or send to rest that awakening.

I have said in my reply to Lord Ronaldshay's speech that we have not taken the offensive; we are not the aggressors, we have not got to stop any single activity. It is the Government that is to stop its aggravatingly offensive activity aimed not at violence but a lawful, disciplined, stern but absolutely non-violent agitation. It is for the Government of India and for it alone to bring about a peaceful atmosphere, if it so desires. It has hurled a bomb-shell in the midst of material rendered inflammable by its own action and wonders that the material is still not inflammable enough to explode. The immediate issue is not now the redress of the three wrongs; the immediate issue is the right of holding public meetings and the right of forming associations for

peaceful purposes. And in vindicating this' right we are fighting the battle not merely on behalf of Non-co-operators, but we are fighting the battle for all schools of politics. It is the condition of any organic growth, and I see in the Viceregal pronouncement an insistence upon submission to a contrary doctrine which an erstwhile exponent of the law of liberty has seen fit to lay down upon finding himself in an atmosphere where there is little regard for law and order on the part of those very men who are supposed to be custodians of law and order. I have only to point to the unprovoked assaults being committed, not in isolated cases, not in one place, but in Bengal, in the Punjab, in Delhi and in the United Provinces. I have no doubt that as repression goes on in its mad career, the reign of terrorism will overtake the whole of this unhappy land. But whether the campaign is conducted on civilised or uncivilised lines, so far as I can see, there is only one way, open to non-co-operators, indeed I contend, even to the people of India. On this question of the right of holding public meetings and forming associations there can be no yielding. We have burnt our boats and we must sail onward till that primary right of human beings is vindicated.

Let me make my own position clear. I am most anxious for a settlement. I want a Round Table Conference. I want our position to be clearly known by everybody who wants to understand it. I impose no conditions, but when conditions are imposed upon me prior to the holding of a conference, I must be allowed to examine those conditions, and if I find that they are suicidal, I must be excused if I don't accept them. The amount of tension

that is created can be regulated solely by the Government of India, for the offensive has been taken by that Government.

THE MALAVIYA CONFERENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*January 19, 1922.*)

The Conference * was both a success and a failure. It was a success in that it showed an earnest desire on the part of those who attended to secure a peaceful solution of the present trouble, and in that it brought under one roof people possessing divergent views. It was a failure in that, though certain resolutions have been adopted, the Conference did not leave on my mind the impression that those who assembled together as a whole realised the gravity of the real issue. The mind of the Conference seemed to be centred more on a round table conference than upon asserting the popular right of free speech, free association and free press which are more than a round table conference. I had expected on the part of the independents to declare their firm attitude that no matter how much they might differ regarding the method of non-co-operation, the freedom of the people was a common heritage and that the assertion of that right was three-fourths of Swaraj, that therefore they would defend that right even with Civil Disobedience, if need be.

* Mr. Malaviya arranged a conference of leaders of all parties at Bombay on 14th January 1922. Sir Sankaran Nair presided on the first day.

However, as the attention of the Conference could not be rivetted on that point, but on a round table conference, the discussion turned upon the essentials of such a conference.

My own position was clear. I would attend any conference as an individual, without any conditions. My purpose as a reformer is to convert people to the view I hold to be right and therefore to see everybody who would care to listen to me. But when I was asked to mention the conditions necessary for an atmosphere favourable for a successful conference, I had to press home certain condition. And I must own that the Resolutions Committee approached my view-point with the greatest sympathy and showed every anxiety to accommodate me. But side by side with this, I observed an admirable disposition on its part to consider the Government's difficulties. Indeed the Government's case could not have been better presented, if it had been directly and officially represented in the Conference.

The result was a compromise. The withdrawal of notifications and the discharge of prisoners coming under the notifications and of the *fatwa* prisoners, *i.e.*, the Ali Brothers and others who have been convicted in respect of the *fatwas* regarding military service, was common cause. The Committee saw the force of the suggestion that the distress warrants should be discharged, the fines imposed upon the Press, etc. should be refunded and that the prisoners convicted for non-violent or otherwise innocent activities under cover of the ordinary laws should be discharged upon the proof of their non-violence. For this purpose, I have suggested

the committee appointed by the conference. But on the Resolutions Committee showing that it would be difficult for the Government to accept such an uncontrolled recommendation, I agreed to the principle of arbitration now imported in the resolution. The second compromise is regarding picketing. My suggestion was that in the event of the round table conference being decided upon, non-co-operation activities of a hostile nature should be suspended and that all picketing except *bona fide* peaceful picketing should also be suspended, pending result of the conference. As the implications of hostile activities appeared to me to be too dangerous to be acceptable, I hastily withdrew my own wording and gladly threw over even *bona fide* peaceful picketing, much though I regretted it. I felt that the friends interested in liquor picketing for the sake of temperance would not mind the temporary sacrifice.

I agreed too to advise the Working Committee to postpone general mass Civil Disobedience contemplated by the Congress to the 31st instant in order to enable the Committee and the Conference to enter into negotiations with the Government. This, I felt, was essential to show our *bona fides*. We could not take up new offensives, whilst negotiations for a conference were being conducted by responsible men. I further undertook to advise the Committee, in the event of the proposed conference coming off, to stop all *hartals* pending the conference. This I hold to be inevitable. *Hartals* are a demonstration against bureaucracy. We cannot continue them, if we are conferring with them for peace. Workers will bear in mind that as yet no activity of the Congress stops save

general Civil Disobedience. On the contrary, enlistment of volunteers and swadeshi propaganda must continue without abatement. Liquor shop picketing may continue where it is absolutely peaceful. It should certainly continue where notices unnecessarily prohibiting picketing have been issued. So may picketing continue regarding schools or foreign cloth shops. But whilst all our activities should be zealously continued, there should be the greatest restraint exercised and every trace of violence or discourtesy avoided. When restraint and courtesy are added to strength, the latter becomes irresistible. Civil Disobedience being an indefeasible right, the preparation for it will continue even if the conference comes off. And the preparations for Civil Disobedience consist in :

1. the enlistment of volunteers,
2. the propaganda of swadeshi,
3. the removal of untouchability,
4. the training in non-violence in word, deed and thought,
5. unity between diverse creeds and classes.

I hear that many are enrolled as volunteers in various parts of India, although they do not wear *Khasli*, do not believe in complete non-violence, or, if they are Hindus, do not believe in untouchability as a crime against humanity. I cannot too often warn the people that every deviation from our own rules retards our progress. It is the quality of our work which will please God and not quantity. Not all the lip Mussalmans and the lip Hindus will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Islam is no stronger than the Kingdom of Heaven. Islam is no stronger than

the best Mussalman. Thousands of nominal followers of Hinduism believe their faith and discredit it. One true and perfect follower of Hinduism is enough to protect it for all time and against the whole world. Similarly, one true and perfect non-co-operator is any day better than a million non-co-operators so-called. The best preparation for Civil Disobedience is to cultivate civility, that is truth and non-violence, amongst ourselves and our surroundings.

The Demand :—In order that all may approach the round table conference with perfect knowledge of the Congress demands, I laid all our cards on the table and reiterated the claims regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. Let me repeat them here :

(1) So far as I can write from memory, full restoration to the Turks of Constantinople, Adrianople, Anatolia including Smyrna and Thrace. Complete withdrawal of non-Muslim influence from Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and therefore Syria and withdrawal of British troops whether English or Indian from these territories.

(2) Full enforcement of the report of the Congress Subcommittee and therefore the stopping of the pensions of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer and other officers named in the report for dismissal.

(3) Swaraj means, in the event of the foregoing demands being granted, full dominion status. The scheme of such Swaraj should be framed by representatives duly elected in terms of the Congress Constitution. That means four annas franchise. Every Indian adult, male or female, paying four annas and signing the Congress creed, will be entitled to be placed on the electoral roll. These electors would elect delegates who would frame

the Swaraj constitution. This shall be given effect to without any change by the British Parliament.

If the Congress programme is so cut and dried, where is the necessity for a conference?—asks the critic. I hold that there is and there always will be.

The method of execution of the demands has to be considered. The Government may have a reasonable and a convincing answer on the claims. The Congressmen have fixed their minimum, but the fixing of the minimum means no more than confidence in the justice of one's cause. It further means that there is no room for bargaining. There can, therefore, be no appeal to one's weakness or incapacity. The appeal can only be addressed to reason. If the Viceroy summons the conference, it means either that he recognises the justice of the claims or hopes to satisfy the Congressmen, among others, of the injustice thereof. He must be confident of the justice of his proposals for a rejection or reduction of the claim. That is my meaning of a meeting of equals who eliminate the idea of force, and instantly shift their ground as they appreciate the injustice of their position. I assure His Excellency the Viceroy and everybody concerned that the Congressmen or non-co-operators are as reasonable beings as may be found on earth or in India. They have every incentive to be so for theirs is the duty of suffering as a result of rejection of any just offer.

I have heard it urged that on the Khilafat the Imperial Government is powerless. I should like to be convinced of this. In that case and if the Imperial Government make common cause with the Mussalmans of India, I should be quite satisfied and take the chance with the

Imperial Government's genuine assistance of convincing the other powers of the justice of the Khilafat claim. And even when the claim is admitted, much requires to be discussed regarding the execution.

Similarly regarding the Punjab. The principle being granted, the details have to be settled. Legal difficulties have been urged about stopping the pensions to the dismissed officials. The reader may not know that Maulana Shaukat Ali's pension (I suppose he occupied the same status as Sir Michael O'Dwyer) was stopped without any inquiry or previous notice to him. I believe that service regulations do provide for removing officers and officials from the pensions list on proof of gross neglect of duty or disloyal service. Anyway, let the Government prove a case for refusal to grant the Punjab demand save the plea of the past services of these officials. I must refuse to weigh their service to the Empire against their disservice to India, assuming the possibility of two such things co-existing.

Swaraj scheme is undoubtedly a matter on which there will be as many minds as there are men and women. And it is eminently a thing to be debated in a conference. But here again there must be a clean mind and no mental reservations. India's freedom must be the supreme interest in everybody's mind. There should be no obstruction such as the pre-occupation of the British elector or the indifference of the House of Commons or the hostility of the House of Lords. No lover of India can possibly take into account these extraneous matters. The only question to consider will be—is India ready for what she wants? Or does she ask like a child for food.

she has no stomach for? That can be determined not by outsiders but by Indians themselves.

From that standpoint, I do consider the idea of the conference for devising a scheme of full Swaraj premature. India has not yet incontestably proved her strength. Her suffering is great indeed, but nothing and not prolonged enough for the object in view. She has to go through greater discipline. I was punctiliously careful not to make non-co-operators party to the conference resolutions, because we are still so weak. When India has evolved disciplined strength, I would knock myself at the Viceregal door for a conference, and I know that the Viceroy will gladly embrace the opportunity whether he be an eminent lawyer or a distinguished militarists. I do not approach directly, because I am conscious of our weakness. But being humble, I make it clear through Moderate or other friends that I would miss not a single opportunity of having honest conferences or consultations. And so I have not hesitated to advise non-co-operators thankfully to meet the Independents and place our services at their disposal to make such use of them as they may deem fit. And if the Viceroy or a party desires a conference it would be foolish for non-co-operators not to respond. The case of non-co-operators depends for success on cultivation of public opinion and public support. They have no other force to back them. If they forfeit public opinion, they have lost the voice of God for the time being.

For the manner of preparing the scheme too, I have simply suggested what appears to me to be a most feasible method. The All-India Congress Committee has not

considered it nor has the Working Committee. The adoption of the Congress franchise is my own suggestion. But what I have laid down as the guiding principle is really unassailable. The scheme of Swaraj is that scheme which popular representatives frame. What happens then to the experts in administration and others who may not be popularly elected? In my opinion, they also should attend and have the vote even, but they must necessarily be in a minority. They must expect to influence the majority by a constant appeal to the logic of facts. Given mutual trust and mutual respect, a round table conference cannot but result in a satisfactory and honourable peace.

An Unfortunate Incident:—The abrupt withdrawal of Sir Sankaran Nair was an unfortunate incident. In my opinion he had nothing to do with my, or later, with Mr. Jinnah's opinions. As speaker, especially, he was exempt from any implied or express identification with anybody's views. I cannot help feeling that Sir Sankaran erred in the conception of his duty as speaker. But as we progress towards democracy, we must be prepared even for such erroneous exercise of independence. I congratulate Sir Sankaran Nair upon his boldly exercising his independence which I have not hesitated to call cussedness in private conversation and upon the independence of the committee in not suffering a nervous collapse but quietly electing Sir Visveshwarayya and voting thanks to the retiring speaker for the services rendered.

POLES ASUNDER

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 26, 1922.)

The debate in the Assembly and the Council of State affords the clearest possible justification for my distrust of the Government and therefore any round table conference at the present moment. The Government supporters consider the Congress demands to be impossible and repression to be the only way possible to put down non-co-operation. If I believed the Congress demands to be impossible and the use of force to be justifiable for putting down the pursuit of impossible ideals, I should also vote with the Government. I have, therefore, no difficulty about understanding and even appreciating the attitude of the Government and its supporters.

But I oppose the Government and thoroughly distrust it, because I so thoroughly understand its attitude. India can never attain freedom by going along the route the Government will take her.

Let us see.

Why is the Khilafat demand impossible? All that the Congress asks in effect is that the Government of India and the Imperial Government, if they wish to retain the people's co-operation, should work with them in getting the demands fulfilled. They should, therefore, perform that part of the obligation which rests with them, and vigorously prosecute the rest as if it was their own grievance. What will the Imperial Government do if France were to attempt to deprive England of Dover, and India

were secretly to help France or openly to show indifference or hostility to England's struggle to retain Dover? Can Indians be expected to sit idle when the Khilafat is vivisected?

What is impossible about the Punjab demand? Why do they talk about the legalities of the case. If they will take care of the moralities, legalities will take care of themselves. As a boy I learnt a legal maxim that where there is a conflict between Law and Equity, the latter should prevail. It is not with me a copy book maxim. But I am told it is immoral to ask for the deprivation of a pension, which is but deferred pay. Why has Sardar Gauhar-singh been deprived of his 'deferred pay' and why are the other pensioners threatened if they should take part in the present agitation? Does a servant who vilifies his employer receive pay or pension? Have Sir Michael O'Dwyer or General Dyer ever admitted their 'error of judgment'? Why should the children of the murdered men of Jallianwalla Baugh, or the men who were brutally flogged or made to crawl, although they had done no wrong, pay those who were responsible for these barbarities? I do not know a single principle of ethics, save that of might, that can justify the continuation of pensions to servants who are unrepentant. The viewpoints of the two parties are so different that what appears to be just and moral to the one, appears unjust and immoral to the other. I venture to claim that in asking for the stoppage of pensions, the Congress is just without being vindictive. It waives prosecution, or impeachment. It waives penalties. It merely refuses still further to participate in the wrong by continuing to give pensions. The truth is that

the Government still considers the two offenders to be distinguished servants of the Crown. *That* attitude has to be changed before a repetition of the Punjab becomes impossible.

As with the Punjab so with Swaraj. It appears to the Government impossible to return to India what is hers. Reforms by instalments is the motto. The underlying idea is not to give anything unless it is absolutely necessary. The differences are so great that I dread to think of Swaraj before the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are put away. They seem so simple in the statement. But they are as difficult as Swaraj because their redress means obedience to India's will.

This is all cold logic. There is nothing impossible about the demands. The impossibility consists in the unwillingness of the power holders to part with the power that should never have been theirs.

Why should there be repression at all if only the Government will do their duty? Assume that violence is a certainty if mass civil disobedience is precipitated. Are the people to be balked of their rights for fear of violence? It does not strike the co-operators that they uphold injustice and add insult to it, when they accuse civil resisters of precipitating a crisis. The Government are deliberately inviting a crisis. They are precipitating violence by removing every one who has any influence over the people and who can keep them non-violent. Co-operators do not see that the action of the Government is like that of a man, who refuses to give food to hungry man and then threatens to shoot him whilst he is attempting to help himself.

In the midst of an enervating atmosphere such as ours, the duty before non-co-operators is clear. They must keep exemplary patience. They must not be goaded into precipitate action. They must refuse battle where they are not ready. It is no business of the Government to keep us non-violent or to help us to remain so. Even their method of restraining violence is exasperatingly violent. In one respect, however, we must feel thankful to them, for their protest and criticism amount to nothing but this, that we do not know how to practise our creed and that we are incompetent to inflict successful violence even if we would. Let us admit both these arguments. We must be true to our creed. Then it is common cause that the Government must lay down arms. And let those who do not believe in creed at least see that *India is neither ready nor willing to meet violence with violence*. I wish those who believe in the necessity of violence for India's freedom will realise the truth of my position. They must not think that because *they* are ready willing to do violence, India is likewise ready or willing. I claim that is unready, *not* because she is helpless *but* because she is unwilling. Therefore non-violence is unexpectedly succeeding, whereas violence, in spite of the vaunted talk of human nature, would have failed. India's past training for ages, I mean the training of the masses, has been against violence. Human nature in India has advanced so far that the doctrine of non-violence is more natural for the people at large than that of violence. Let us also remember that the experiences of Bombay and Madras prove my proposition. If the people of India were violent by nature, there was enough in Bombay and Madras to give rise to an unquen-

chable conflagration. A little violence like dirt is enough to disturb or soil a peaceful or clean surface, but either being a foreign addition, is soon removed. To train India for violence and thus to wrest Swaraj by violence is a work of ages. I verily believe that this wonderful manifestation of energy and national consciousness is purely and simply due to the advent of non-violence. People have come to their own. Let no hasty action arrest its progress.

THE IMMEDIATE ISSUE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 5, 1921.)

Swaraj, the Khilafat, the Punjab occupy a subordinate place to the issue sprung upon the country by the Government. We must first make good the right of free speech and free association before we can make any further progress towards our goal. The Government would kill us if they could by a flank attack. To accept defeat in the matter of free speech and free association is to court disaster. If the Government is allowed to destroy non-violent activities in the country however dangerous they may be to its existence, even the moderates' work must come to a standstill. In the general interest therefore we must defend these elementary rights with our lives. We cannot be coerced into welcoming the Prince nor can we be coerced into disbanding volunteer associations or giving up any other activities which we may deem desirable for our growth.

The safest and the quickest way to defend these rights is to ignore the restriction. We must speak the Truth under a shower of bullets. We must band together in the face of bayonets. No cost is too great for purchasing these fundamental rights. And on this there can be no compromise, no parleying, no conference. Withdrawal of notifications of disbandment and prohibition orders and discharge of all who are imprisoned for non-violent activities must precede any conference or settlement. We must be content to die, if we cannot live as free men and women.

I wish I could persuade everybody that civil disobedience is the inherent right of a citizen. He dare not give it up without ceasing to be a man. Civil disobedience is never followed by anarchy. Criminal disobedience can lead to it. Every state puts down criminal disobedience by force. It perishes, if it does not. But to put down civil disobedience is to attempt to imprison conscience. Civil disobedience can only lead to strength and purity. A civil resister never uses arms and hence he is harmless to a state, that is at all willing to listen to the voice of public opinion. He is dangerous for an autocratic state, for he brings about its fall by engaging public opinion upon the matter for which he resists the state. Civil disobedience therefore becomes a sacred duty when the state has become lawless, or which is the same thing, corrupt. And a citizen that barter with such a state shares its corruption or lawlessness.

It is therefore possible to question the wisdom of applying civil disobedience in respect of a particular act or law; it is possible to advise delay and caution. But the right

itself cannot be allowed to the questioned. It is a birth-right that cannot be surrendered without surrender of one's self-respect.

At the same time that the right of civil disobedience is insisted upon, its use must be guarded by all conceivable restrictions. Every possible provision should be made against an outbreak of violence or general lawlessness. Its area as well as its scope should also be limited to the barest necessity of the case. In the present case therefore aggressive civil disobedience should be confined to a vindication of the right of free speech and free association. In other words non-co operation, so long as it remains non-violent, must be allowed to continue without let or hindrance. When that position is attained it is time for representative conference to be summoned for the settlement of Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj, but not till then.

NON-PAYMENT OF TAXES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 26, 1922.)

The idea of non-payment of taxes is in the air. The Andhras have made us more familiar with the cry than any other part of India. Whilst the Congress has given provincial autonomy to every Province, I have ventured to warn the provinces against embarking upon a non-payment campaign till I had tried the experiment myself in some area under my own supervision. I abide by that warning. I must also draw attention to the fact that we are not to start offensive civil disobedience till the 31st

instant, or if it is sooner, till the Malaviya Conference Committee knows the result of its negotiations and knows that the proposed round table conference is not to come off. Therefore any suspension of taxes at the present moment can only be regarded as temporary holding back pending the result of the negotiations carried on by that Committee. But 31st January will be soon upon us. And it is necessary to consider the question of non-payment of taxes in all its bearings.

On this subject a friend who is in deep sympathy with the national movement, and who is a fairly accurate student of it, thus expresses his apprehensions :—

"I have often thought to what extent the non-violent non-co-operation movement transgresses the religious limits, when it embarks on civil disobedience in the form of non-payment of taxes. I look upon the non-violent non-co-operation as essentially a spiritual movement. I know Mr. Gandhi does not think it otherwise. Will not the programme of the non-payment of taxes transgress the religious limit and lead to violence and bring into the movement people who are not as yet saturated with the principle of non-violence? Is not Mr. Gandhi holding out, however unconsciously, a material bait for his spiritual movement by which he means to conquer the Government? Recent events have shown that the temper of violence and the belief in violence are not eliminated from our character in the mass. And therefore it would be a leap in the dark fraught with disastrous consequences to carry out the programme of civil disobedience in the form of non-payment of taxes. I am therefore most anxious that Mr. Gandhi should not begin civil disobedience in this form as yet."

The validity of the objection lies in the statement that the non-payment campaign will bring into the movement people who are not as yet saturated with the principle of non-violence. This is very true, and because it is true, non-payment does 'hold out a material bait.' It follows, therefore, that we must not resort to non-payment.

because of the possibility of a ready response. The readiness is a fatal temptation. Such non-payment will not be civil or non-violent, but it will be criminal or fraught with the greatest possibility of violence. Let us remember the experience of Pandit Javaharlal Nehru when the peasants, after they had taken the pledge of non-violence, told him that if he advised them to do violence, they would be certainly ready to do so. Not until the peasantry is trained to understand the reason and the virtue of *civil* non-payment and is prepared to look with calm resignation upon the confiscation (which can only be temporary) of their holdings and the forced sale of their cattle and other belongings, may they be advised to withhold payment of taxes. They must be told what happened in holy Palestine. The Arabs who were fined were surrounded by soldiers. Aeroplanes were hovering overhead. And the sturdy men were dispossessed of their cattle. The latter were impounded and left without fodder and even water. When the Arabs, stupefied and rendered helpless, brought the fine and additional penalty, as if to mock them, they had their dead and dying cattle returned to them. Worse things can and certainly will happen in India. Are the Indian peasantry prepared to remain absolutely non-violent, and see their cattle taken away from them to die of hunger and thirst? I know that such things have already happened in Andhra Desh. If the peasantry in general knowingly and deliberately remain peaceful even in such trying circumstances, they are nearly ready for non-payment.

I say 'nearly ready,' for non-payment is intended to transfer the power from the bureaucracy into our hands. It

is therefore not enough that the peasantry remain non-violent. Non-violence is certainly nine-tenths of the battle but it is not all. The peasantry may remain non-violent, but may not treat the untouchables as their brethren ; they may not regard Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians, Jews, Parsis, as the case may be, their brethren; they may not have learnt the economic and the moral value of the *charkha* and the *khaddar*. If they have not, they cannot gain Swaraj. They will not do all these things after Swaraj, if they will not do them now. They must be taught to know that the practice of these national virtues means Swaraj.

Thus civil non-payment of taxes is a privilege capable of being exercised only after rigorous training. And even as *civil* disobedience is difficult in the case of a habitual offender against the laws of the state, so is *civil* non-payment difficult for those who have hitherto been in the habit of withholding payment of taxes on the slightest pretext. Civil non-payment of taxes is indeed the last stage in non-co-operation. We must not resort to it till we have tried the other forms of civil disobedience. And it will be the height of unwisdom to experiment with non-payment in large or many areas in the beginning stages.

I hear the talk even of refusing payment of rent to Zamindars. It must not be forgotten that we are not non-co-operating with Zamindars, whether Indian or foreign. We are engaged in a fight with one big Zamindar—the bureaucracy—which has made of us and the Zamindars themselves serfs. We must try to bring round the Zamindars to our side, and isolate the big Zamindar. But if they will not come to us, we must be patient with them. We may not even proclaim a social

boycott against them. That is to say, we may not refuse social service such as dhobie, barber, etc. to them. In areas under permanent settlement therefore, there can be no non-paymant campaign except in respect of cesses that might be payable directly to the Government. But the mention of Zamindars merely shows the difficulties that beset us in the pursuit of no-tax campaign. All things considered, therefore, it is my deliberate opinion that the no-tax movement for the objects of the Congress should be for the time being left to me ; meanwhile workers can develop their own districts along constructive lines. They can discover various other methods of offering mass civil disobedience, and then, as the people become purified and enlightened, lead them on to non-payment.

As for the Ardhras where preparations on an intensive scale have already been made, I do not wish to damp the ardour of the workers. If they are satisfied that the people in the selected areas fulfil all the tests laid down at Delhi, and that they are capable of endless suffering without retaliation, I have nothing to say but to pronounce, " God bless the Andhras." They must know that the responsibility will be entirely theirs for any mishap that may occur. They will not be blamed by anybody if they do not take up the no tax movement.

BARDOLI'S DECISION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 22, 1920.)

Bardoli has come to a momentous decision. It has made its final and irrevocable choice. Vithalbhai Patel, the President, addressed a conference of the representatives of the Taluka in a speech impressive for its warning. He certainly did not mince matters. There was an audience of *khaddar* clad representatives numbering 4,000. There were five hundred women, a large majority of whom were also in *khaddar*. They were interested and interesting listeners. It was an audience of sober, responsible men and woman with a stake.

I followed Vithalbhai and went through every one of the conditions of mass Civil Disobedience laid down by the Congress. I took the sense of the meeting on every one of the conditions separately. They understood the implications of Hindu-Muslim-Parsi-Christian unity. They realised the significance and the truth of non-violence. They saw what the removal of untouchability meant; they were prepared, not merely to take into National Schools, but to induce 'untouchable' children to join them; they have had no objection to the 'untouchable' drawing water from the village wells. They knew that they were to nurse the 'untouchable' sick as they would nurse their ailing neighbours. They knew that they could not exercise the privilege of non-payment of revenue and other forms of Civil Disobedience until they had purified themselves in the manner described by

me. They knew, too, that they had to become industrious and spin their own yarn and weave their own *khaddar*. And lastly, they were ready to face forfeiture of their movables, their cattle and their land. They were ready to face imprisonment and even death, if necessary, and they would do all this without resentment.

There was an old dissentient voice, on the question of untouchability. He said, what I said was right in theory, but it was difficult in practice to break down the custom all of a sudden. I drove the point home that the audience had made up its mind.

Before the larger meeting, I had met the real workers about fifty in number. Before that meeting, Vithalbhai Patel, some workers and I conferred together and felt that we would pass a resolution postponing the decision for about a fortnight, to make the swadeshi preparation more complete and removal of untouchability more certain by actually having untouchable children in all the sixty National Schools. The brave and earnest workers of Bardoli will not listen to the postponement. They were certain that more than 50 per cent. of the Hindu population were quite ready about untouchability and they were sure of being able to manufacture enough *khaddar* for their future wants. They were bent on trying conclusions with the Government. They bore down every objection raised by Vithalbhai Patel, and Abbas Tyabji, with his hoary beard and ever smiling face, was there to utter the warning. But they would not budge an inch from their position and so the resolution which I give below was unanimously passed:—

“After having fully understood and considered the

conditions as essential for the starting of mass Civil Disobedience, this Conference of the inhabitants of the Bardoli Taluka resolves that this Taluka is fit for mass Civil Disobedience.

This Conference is of opinion :

(a) That for the redress of India's grievances, unity among Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis, Christians and other communities of India is absolutely necessary.

(b) That non-violence, patience and endurance are the only remedy for the redress of the said grievances.

(c) That the use of the spinning wheel in every home, and the adoption of hand-spun and hand-woven garments to the exclusion of all other cloth by every individual are indispensable for India's freedom.

(d) That Swaraj is impossible without complete removal of untouchability by the Hindus.

(e) That for the people's progress and for the attainment of freedom, readiness to sacrifice movable and immovable property, to suffer imprisonment and, if necessary, to lay down one's life is indispensable.

"The Conference hopes that the Bardoli Taluka will have the privilege to be the first for the aforesaid sacrifices, and this Conference hereby respectfully informs the Working Committee that unless the Working Committee otherwise decides or unless the proposed Round Table Conference is held, this Taluka will immediately commence mass Civil Disobedience under the advice and guidance of Mr. Gandhi and the President of Conference.

"This Conference recommends that those tax-payers of the Taluka who are ready and willing to abide by the

conditions laid down by the Congress for mass Civil Disobedience, will refrain, till further instruction, from paying land revenue and other taxes due to the Government".

Who knows the issue? Who knows whether the men and women of Bardoli will stand the repression that the Government may resort to? God only knows. In His name has the battle been undertaken. He must finish it.

The Government have acted hitherto in a most exemplary manner. They might have prohibited the Conference. They did not. They know the workers. They could have removed them long ago. They have not done so. They have not interfered with any of the activities of the people. They have permitted them to make all preparations. I have watched their conduct with wonder and admiration. Both sides have up to the time of writing behaved in a manner worthy of chivalrous warriors of old. In this battle of peace, it ought not to be otherwise. If the battle continues in this fashion, it will end only in one way. Whoever has the ear of 85,000 men and women of Bardoli will gain the day.

The Working Committee has to sit and pass its judgment upon Bardoli's decision. The Viceroy has still choice and will have yet another choice given to him. No charge of hurry, want of preparation or thought, no charge of discourtesy will it be possible to bring against the people of Bardoli.

THE ONLY ISSUE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 9, 1922.)

It was not without deep thought and prayer that I wrote the letter to His Excellency the Viceroy. It is not a threat because every word in it is meant. It is a heart-felt prayer to the tyrant to desist from evil. Lord Reading is not the tyrant. The system of which he is himself an unconscious and helpless victim is the tyrant. But every system becomes embodied in a person. To day it is personified in Lord Reading, no matter how unconscious he is of it. I have invited him in all humility seriously to consider the position and ask himself whether the official lawlessness can in any case be justified. Let him turn to the week's summary to which the old heading. "In Cold Blood" is restored. It is all true if the witnesses are not all liars. Should these things be?

But what of defiance of authority? Must defiance (non-violent at least) indeed of authority be met by barbarous and wicked abuse of it?

If the Viceroy cannot or will not see such an incredibly simple issue, must India sit still? Defensive civil disobedience *must* continue at any cost. If the whole of India were to say that even peaceful public meetings may not be held without permission, that peaceful volunteer associations may not be formed without permission and that newspapers cannot be published without permission, that prohibition cannot be accepted. For a man may not be expected to ask for another's leave to breathe or eat or

drink. The three things I have mentioned are the breath, the food and the drink of public life.

MR. GANDHI'S LETTER TO THE VICEROY
To

His Excellency,
The Viceroy,
Delhi.

Sir,

Bardoli is a small *tehsil* in the Surat District in the Bombay Presidency, having a population of about 87,000 all told.

On the 29th ultimo it decided under the presidency of Mr. Vithalbhai Patel to embark on mass civil disobedience, having proved its fitness for it in terms of the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee which met at Delhi during the first week of November last. But as I am perhaps chiefly responsible for Bardoli's decision, I owe it to your Excellency and the public to explain the situation under which the decision has been taken.

It was intended under the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, before referred to, to make Bardoli the first unit for mass civil disobedience in order to mark the national revolt against the Government for its consistently criminal refusal to appreciate India's resolve regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj.

Then followed the unfortunate and regrettable rioting on the 17th November last in Bombay, resulting in the postponement of the step contemplated by Bardoli.

Meanwhile repression of a virulent type has taken place with the concurrence of the Government of India in Bengal, Assam, the United Provinces, the Punjab, the

Province of Delhi and in a way in Bihar and Orissa and elsewhere. I know that you have objected to the use of the word "repression" for describing the action of the authorities in these provinces. In my opinion when action is taken which is in excess of the requirement of a situation, it is undoubtedly repression. The looting of property, assaults on innocent people, the brutal treatment of prisoners in the jails including flogging can in no sense be described as legal, civilized or in any way necessary. This official lawlessness cannot be described by any other term but lawless repression. Intimidation by non-co-operators or their sympathisers to a certain extent in connection with *hartals* and picketing may be admitted but in no case can it be held to justify the wholesale suppression of peaceful volunteering or equally peaceful public meetings under a distorted use of an extraordinary law which was passed in order to deal with activities which were manifestly violent both in intention and action, nor is it possible to designate as otherwise than repression, action taken against innocent people under what has appeared to many of us an illegal use of the ordinary law, nor again can the administrative interference with the liberty of the press under a law that is under promise of repeal be regarded as anything but repression.

The immediate task before the country, therefore, is to rescue from paralysis freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of the press. In the present mode of the Government of India and in the present unprepared state of the country in respect of complete control of the forces of the violence, non-co-operators

were unwilling to have anything to do with the Malaviya Conference whose object was to induce Your Excellency to convene a Round Table Conference. But I was anxious to avoid all avoidable suffering, I had no hesitation in advising the Working Committee of the Congress to accept the recommendations of that Conference. Although in my opinion the terms were quite in keeping with your own requirements as I understood them through your Calcutta speech and otherwise, you have summarily rejected the proposal.

In the circumstances, there is nothing before the country but to adopt some non-violent method for the enforcement of its demands including the elementary rights of free speech, free association and free press. In my humble opinion the recent events are a clear departure from the civilised policy laid down by Your Excellency at the time of the generous, manly and unconditional apology of the Ali Brothers *viz.*, that the Government of India should not interfere with the activities of non-co-operation so long as they remained non-violent in word and deed. Had the Government's policy remained neutral and allowed public opinion to ripen and have its full effect, it would have been possible to advise postponement of the adoption of civil disobedience of an aggressive type till the Congress had acquired fuller control over the forces of violence in the country and enforced greater discipline among the millions of its adherents. But this lawless repression (in a way unparalleled in the history of this unfortunate country) has made the immediate adoption of mass civil disobedience an imperative duty. The Working Committee of the Congress has restricted it to only certain areas to be select

ted by me from time to time, and at present it is confined only to Bardoli. I may, under said authority, give my consent at once in respect of a group of 100 villages in Guntur in the Madras Presidency, provided they can strictly conform to the conditions of non-violence, unity among different classes, the adoption and manufacture of handspun *khadi* and untouchability.

But before the people of Bardoli actually commence mass 'civil disobedience, I would respectfully urge you as the head of the Government of India, finally to revise your policy and set free all the non-co-operating prisoners who are convicted or under trial for non-violent activities and to declare in clear terms a policy of absolute non-interference with all non-violent activities in the country whether they be regarding the redress of the Khilafat or the Punjab wrongs or Swaraj or any other purpose and even though they fall under the repressive sections of the Penal Code or the Criminal Procedure Code or other repressive laws subject always to the condition of non-violence. I would further urge you to free the Press from all administrative control and to restore all the fines and forfeitures recently imposed. In thus urging I am asking Your Excellency to do what is benign done to-day in every country which is deemed to be under civilized Government. If you can see your way to make the necessary declaration within seven days of the date of publication of this manifesto, I shall be prepared to advise postponement of civil disobedience of an aggressive character, till the imprisoned workers have, after their discharge, reviewed the whole situation and considered the position *de novo*.

If the Government make the requested declaration I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall therefore have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding public opinion without violent restraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive civil disobedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuse to yield to clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India.

I remain,
Your Excellency's faithful
servant and friend,
M. K. Gandhi.

IN A TANGLE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 9, 1922.)

Sir Henry Wheeler has given us an accurate expression for describing the position of the Bengal Government and for that matter even the Government of India. He considered the debate in the Bengal Legislative Council on the resolution calling upon the Government to cancel all the repressive notices and to discharge all the prisoners convicted under them 'a hopeless unreality.' For him, who perhaps does not know what is going on in Bengal except what his subordinates choose to tell him, the debate may be 'a hopeless unreality.' The fifty councillors who

have first hand knowledge of things as they are, refused to be misled by Sir Henry's oratory. To them, the position taken up by the Bengal Government was 'a hopeless unreality'. The lawlessness in the country described by Sir Henry Wheeler existed only in his imagination. What was real did not in their estimation need the drastic measures that the Bengal Government had taken. The Councillors knew that such lawlessness as existed in Bengal was disciplined, civil, non-violent and necessitated by the thoughtless action of the authorities. Sir Henry Wheeler failed to drive home to his audience his conviction that Chitta Ranjan Das, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Shyam Sundar Chakravarti and now even Babu Hardayal Nag, the aged President of the Provincial Congress Committee, had any mischievous intention. With the imprisonment of these trusted leaders of the people and many other innocent workers in their minds, the terrifying description given by Sir Henry Wheeler appeared to the members as unreal as it possibly could be and failed to frighten them into rejecting the resolution. The councillors deserve congratulations for the courageous stand they took up for freedom of opinion, because the lawlessness that Sir Henry Wheeler complained of amounts to no more than insistence in defiance of prohibitory orders upon the exercise of the right of free speech and free association.

Forcible dispersal of peaceful meetings, search and seizure of Congress and Khilafat papers and assaults upon the public were such a grim reality with the councillors that they had no choice left to them but to support the resolution. It is worthy of note that Sir Henry Wheeler's

amendment was by no means of an uncompromising nature. He offered a non-official committee to go into the matter, but the councillors very properly rejected the compromise. They were not prepared to have the evidence of their own senses disputed by any committee. The Bengal Government must now find itself in a tangle. If it releases the innocent prisoners and recalls its precious notices, the Congress and Khilafat organisations must go on with redoubled vigour. If it refuses to carry out the resolution, it must forfeit the support of the moderates to a large extent. Of course, it can live without that support, as it has done all these long years. But it must know that a new era has dawned upon India. The people are no longer amenable to repression. They are becoming increasingly conscious of their strength. They are becoming increasingly inured to sufferings. No Government in the world can possibly repress into submission a people strong and willing enough to suffer.

What is true of Bengal is true of Bihar. The Bihar Council also has spoken in no uncertain terms. The Council of the United Provinces has accepted a compromise, but even there the Government has really no case. It has become difficult for me in spite of doubling the size of *Young India* to quote all the reports of terrible repression received from almost every part of India. It is not now mere imprisonment. It is shameful disregard and equally shameful distortion even of repressive laws.

Sir Henry Wheeler has given us also another good expression—'tyranny of words and phrases'. He would not be tyrannised by the word 'repression.' He says every law is repressive and that the public should

not be frightened by the word but that they should look at the reality. Let us then face the reality and go behind the tyranny of the phrase 'Law and Order'. Sir Hormusji Wadia eloquently reminded the Malaviya Conference that many a dark deed was done in the time of the Bourbons in France and elsewhere in the sacred name of 'Law and Order.' If we would get rid of the magic spell of those two words, we would find that lives and property of the people of India have been rendered unsafe by the acts of the administrators of 'Law and Order.' It is a sign of the times that the people, even councillors, refuse to live under the 'tyranny of words and phrases' and be deceived by the hopeless unreality of the Government's position. Non-co-operation is a strong solvent and we shall soon find that both the Government and the people will have to come to grips with hopeful realities and get out of the maze of hopeless unrealities in which both have hitherto lived.

AWAKENING IN ANDHRADESHA

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 2, 1922.)

To the date of writing the following two telegrams have been received at the *Young India* office from the Secretary of the Provincial Congress Committee:

(1) The Andhra Provincial Congress Working Committee met yesterday at Guntur in Desabhakta's house. Messrs. Bhograju, Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Tanguturu Prakasam Dhanmayya, Ramachandra Rao, Kasindhuni Nagaswarrao, Dandu Narayanrao, Deshbhakta Konda Venkatappayya and others were present. Several ryots from different

parts of the District, including Pedanandipadu, also attended the meeting and made representations of the conditions prevailing in their places. A graphic description was given how many male adults, including very aged men, enlisted themselves as volunteers in each one of the 50 villages in the neighbourhood of Pedanandipadu and how every one fully clad in *khaddar* has been serving and observing strict non-violence in spite of provocation sometimes given by the military drafted there, the attachments of movables and high-handed removal of carts and bulls even without a show of restraint. They have also stated that in almost all villages all the village officers including the *vettians* have resigned their appointments. Accounts of resignations of village officers in other areas also were given. The Working Committee after prolonged deliberation as a measure of special caution adopted the following resolution

" This Committee is of opinion that the Guntur District Congress Committee should, instead of carrying on the campaign of non-payment of taxes in several talukas simultaneously as previously resolved by them, limit the area and appoint a Committee to investigate as to how far the Delhi conditions are satisfied in the said area and resolve on the question of final refusal of taxes in accordance with the opinion of the said Committee "

(2) " Guntur Congress Committee met day before yesterday in the house of Deshabhakta at I p. m. for the purpose of considering, amongst other things, the resolution of the Working Committee of the Provincial Congress of the 25th on the question of non-payment of taxes. Mr. Anche Siviah, a landing ryot, and President, District Congress Committee, presided. Mr. Prakasam who came here for the Working Committee meeting of the Provincial Congress Committee was also present. In response to a question made to them, leading ryots from different Talukas in the District and some Congress workers also attended the meeting. Having been invited to explain the situation in their respective talukas and *fircas*, representative ryots gave accounts of the progress of the movement among the people. Most of them showed their determination to carry on the campaign in spite of all difficulties, while some expressed that some of the conditions of the Delhi resolution had not been fully satisfied in the *fircas* to which they belonged, and that there was need for further preparation in the matter of untouchability, and in one or two even in respect of non-violence. Mr. Prakasam addressed the meeting dealing at some length on the responsibility of the step taken up by the people of the District. He quoted and explain-

ed the letter of Mahatmaji regarding non-payment of taxes published in the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 26th. Mr Venkatappaiah stated that the necessity for conveying this arose out of the letter addressed to him by Mahatmaji and subsequent correspondence with him. Delhi resolution referred to areas where intensive preparations had been made. Amongst these that spoke on the occasion was Mr Patri Anantharow of Atulur, who, in view of his imminent arrest by the police, came to the meeting, gave an account of the readiness of the people of his village and areas he had visited, and urged upon the necessity of continuing the movement undeterred, and left the meeting saying that he would be arrested forthwith. Hardly had he passed a few paces from the meeting when he was arrested and taken away by the police. Notwithstanding this incident, the meeting continued till 8 p. m. when it was adjourned to yesterday, not one amongst the audience getting out of the meeting. The members of the District Congress Committee reassembled in the house of Deshabhakti yesterday morning at 8 a. m. and after prolonged discussion the following resolutions were adopted —

(1) In view of the resolution of the Working Committee of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee dated the 25th, this meeting appoints the gentlemen named below, as a special committee to enquire in the different areas of Guntur District as to how far conditions of Delhi Resolution have been satisfied and how far they have qualified themselves for Civil Disobedience by way of non-payment of taxes, and send up their report to the District Congress Committee by the 10th February. This committee further resolves that, soon after the receipt of the report above mentioned, it be placed before the meeting of the District Congress Committee and a final resolution be adopted on the question of non-payment of taxes and until then the people in the areas specified in the resolution passed at Ponur do continue the suspension of non-payment of taxes. Members of the Special Committee are Sjt T. Prakasam, Dandu Narain Rau and K. Nageshwar Rao.

(2) This meeting tenders its hearty congratulations to all patriots who have been sent to jail from this District since the meeting at Ponur. This meeting expresses its grateful appreciation of the resignations by village officers in different parts of the District, and urges upon other village officers also the necessity of giving up their offices and helping the great national movement.

The following is the Associated Press Message about Government preparations :—

“In regard to the state of affairs in Guntur where Civil Disobedience and non-payment of taxes campaign and resignation of village officers are in operation, Madras Government proposes to undertake emergency legislation in direction of amending Madras Revenue Recovery Act (2 of 1864) mainly to do away with intervening period allowed under the present Act between distraint and attachment of property and to bring at once to sale effects of ryot who refuse to pay his dues. Other steps will also be taken by Government on the executive side such as institution of disobeying area subject to such exemptions as may be ordered by the Government in favour of persons who shall, by date to be prescribed, have paid into Government treasury or to officer appointed for the purpose taxes due from them. Where land is bought in by Government owing to combination to prevent bidding, opportunity will be taken to provide land for members of depressed classes. With regard to resignations of village officers the Government say they cannot be accepted under the circumstances and if officers refuse to carry on duties they must be dismissed.”

In my opinion, the Government has the right to take precautionary measures of the kind foreshadowed. It has the right to suspend ordinary legislation when it is threatened with combined suspension of its revenue. That a wise Government would not exasperate public opinion into refusal to pay taxes is of course true. But a Government that rides roughshod over popular opinion, cannot be expected to allow itself to be extinguished without an effort. The least, therefore, it would do is to protect its revenue collection. Nor is it possible

to cavil at the proposed transfer of confiscated property to the members of the depressed classes. Such an arrangement should suit both parties. Non-co-operators have undertaken to be non-violent, to risk the loss of their all for the purpose of gaining their end and must therefore, allow their belongings to be sold. The Government, on the other hand, must try, if it can, to break the movement of non-payment and to apply all remedies just enough to secure collection. The proposal to allow the depressed classes to bid for and purchase forfeited lands is ideal. What can be better than that the forfeited lands should be temporarily occupied by the very classes whom we want to see raised from their depressed state ?

I use the adverb 'temporarily,' for the present occupiers must have faith in their mission to know that they must get Swaraj and that under Swaraj they must be restored to their original status with honour added thereto. The depressed classes, who are being used as pawns in the game by the Government, cannot be adversely affected by dispossession, for it will be the primary care of the Swaraj Government to see them well-settled, happy and contented.

So much for the necessary Government measure. The panic that has possessed them shows a guilty conscience. They do not rely upon their popularity to secure payment. They have to rely upon the bayonet and persecution to do so. They are arresting popular leaders and goading the people to violence so as to enable them to justify 'bloody' measures.

And therein lies the test of the Andhras. They have

hitherto proved their bravery and sacrifice. Their chosen leaders have gone to jail. Their cattle have been taken away from them and they have remained still. The worst, however, is yet to come. When the Government military is opened on them, they are expected to expose their willing breasts, not their unwilling backs, to the bullets and still not harbour revenge or resentment. They must let their utensils and belongings be taken away from them, whilst, like Draupadi or Prahlād, they are praying to God and proving their faith in Him.

Non-payment is a privilege. This is meant not to enrich the resisters, but by their voluntary poverty to enrich the nation. And they can exercise the privilege only if they have purified themselves, only if they are wearing handspun *khaddar* to the exclusion of foreign cloth and, if, being Hindus, they have washed themselves clean of the taint of untouchability and are prepared to treat the untouchable as a privileged brother. They must not grudgingly touch him, but they must lovingly embrace him and serve him. The touch must be a token of true penitence even as we expect the Government to be truly penitent regarding the many wrongs done to us. No niggardly acceptance of the inevitable will appear pleasing to God. It must be a thorough change of heart. We must share our schools with them, we must share our public places with them. We must nurse them in their sickness as we would nurse a brother. We must not be their patrons. We must not twist religious texts against them. We must expunge texts that are of doubtful origin and are capable of interpretation against their human rights. We must gladly give up custom that is

against reason, justice, and religion of the heart. We must not ignorantly cling to bad custom and part with it when we must, like a miser parting with his ill-gotten hoard out of pressure and expedience.

I have dwelt at length upon untouchability because I have received wires and letters warning me again accepting assurances of complaisance with the Congress condition about untouchability. They tell me that the Andhras are not ready to give up untouchability. I urge the leaders to be strictly on the watch. The slightest deviation from the right path will irreparably injure our cause. God requires the purest sacrifice. Hinduism is on its trial equally with Islam and Christianity. Hindus will be false representatives of their religion of the Upanishads, which recognises no privilege but that of merit and which accepts nothing that does not appeal to the heart and reason.

The Andhras are a virile people proud of their traditions. They are a devoutly religious people capable of sacrifice. Much is expected of them by the country and I have every hope that they will not be found wanting. They will lose nothing by waiting if they are not ready for exact fulfilment of all conditions. But they will lose all and ill serve the country if they go to battle without full preparation.

DANGER OF MASS MOVEMENT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 2, 1922.)

Whilst there is every reason for self-gratification over mass awakening, it would be foolish to ignore its undoubted dangers. I have just read a notice in the paper that a girl has been pretending to be my daughter and receiving on that account all kinds of attention. I do not mind owning, I should be proud to own, thousands of good, restrained girl as my daughters. They will do credit to me and the country, The world would recognise them as members of an ever increasing family by adoption. As it is, I have to remark for the tenth time that I do not possess the good fortune to have a daughter. There is a tiny 'untouchable' girl whom I do proudly call my adopted daughter. She has brought happiness to me, and I hope by the time she has grown up she will bring truth and humility to her future field of service. To-day she is a veritable 'devil.' She believes in all play and no work. She finds it hard to work without the ebony ruler which used to keep her straight in her parental home. But I do not mind this charming idler of seven years claiming me as father. There are also some grown up girls who permit me the pleasure of claiming them as my daughters, but then they make it difficult for me to live up to the standard they exact from me. They are ever in danger of my being a discreditable father to them. But I must inform all the girls of India that I decline to run the risk of being discredited by their

forcible adoption. I want certainly to adopt all the exacting girls like the ones whose names too I dare not give to the world.

But the reported forcible adoption of me by a girl is a comparatively harmless pastime. I hear that a gentleman by name Motilal Puncholi hailing from Udaipur claims to be my disciple and to preach temperance and what not among the rustics of the Rajputana States. He is reported to be surrounded by an armed crowd of admirers and establishing his kingdom or some otherdom wherever he goes. He claims too miraculous powers. He or his admirers are reported to also have done some destructive work. I wish that people will once for all understand that I have no disciples. I have for the time being at any rate no existence apart from the Congress and the Khilafat Committees. All my activity is referable to these two organisations. None works in my name: none has authority to use my name save under my own writing. No one has any work save the Congress or the Khilafat work. And nobody has any authority from me to use any arms, even sticks, against any person.

I understand that these brave but simple rustics have been induced to refuse payment of taxes due to the State to which they belong. They are even told that I have asked the tax-prayers belonging to the Sirohi State not to pay more than Rs. 1½ each. Now I know nothing of all this. No one has consulted me about the matter. Pandit Ramakant Malaviya, chief minister of the State, has kindly brought the matter to my notice and he tells me that great mischief is being done in my

name. If my writing reaches these countrymen at all, I would like to tell them that they should lay all their grievances before the state authorities and never resort to arms. If they wish to withhold payment of tax which they consider excessive, it is their right. But it is a right never to be exercised lightly. They must cultivate public opinion and let their case see the light of day. If they do not take these precautions, they will find everything and everybody arrayed against them and they will find themselves heavy losers in the end.

A WARNING VOICE FROM BENGAL

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 2, 1922.)

There is a friend, an old and tried servant of the nation, who never fails to inform me of threatening clouds that appear in time and again on the horizon in Bengal. This time he warns me against countenancing a general non-payment movement. He thinks that precipitate action is quite likely in Bengal as most of the leaders are in jail. I cannot complain, but I cannot help noting that the imprisonment of leaders is due to the criminal folly of the Government which has treated the real peace-makers as if they were peace-breakers. The Government are inviting violence. They are, as i of a set purpose, preparing the country for violence. But here again I must not complain. I admit that most of us had expected all this and more, and yet we came to the conclusion that we had to take our courage in both our

hands and move forward without faltering. Our trust then was, as it to-day is, in God.

But I know that we must take every possible precaution to avert every unexpected crisis. I have therefore strongly advised and advise again that wisdom requires that all parts of India should wait for the experiment which I have undertaken personally to supervise. Bengal has done much. She has worked wonders, she has suffered much, is still suffering and is still keeping herself under great restraint. would appeal to all the Bengal leaders to rest on their oars and not to take a single new step. Let them by all means assert the right of free speech and free association. But there is no occasion for embarking on mass Civil Disobedience, or non-payment, which is one phase of it. The workers will have taken the masses through a richer discipline by advising them to pay the rents due for the current period.

CAUTION ABOUT CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 9, 1922.)

Writing of his own District, Lala Shyamlal says, "The District Magistrate here does not believe in making arrests unless there is apprehension of a breach of the peace. The result is that our volunteers are having their own way. No foreign cloth is being imported. No liquor contract has been sold." Lala Shyamlal then inquires whether in the districts where no arrests are made people should go out of their way to court arrest.

I thought that I had made the position absolutely clear in previous issues. Whilst we may do nothing to avoid arrest in the ordinary course of our duty, we must not go outside our beat in order to compel arrest. That would be either aggressive civil disobedience or criminal disobedience. The latter is out of question. The former i. e., aggressive civil disobedience is right to be exercised when necessary and when we are thoroughly ready, and is also a duty we must discharge if we are ready and circumstances require the performance of it. But aggressive civil disobedience whether mass or individual is a most dangerous weapon though also the most effective among all the peaceful weapons at our disposal. I am myself satisfied that the country as a whole is not ready for this form of self-assertion. We have to go through much greater and stricter discipline. We have to understand the exact, I was almost going to say, the spiritual value of obedience to laws and discipline which may be irksome and even repugnant to us. Assertive civil disobedience is a right that accrues to us only after severe *tapasya* through which we have not yet gone. Any premature resort to assertive civil disobedience therefore may precipitate a crisis we neither anticipate nor want, and which we must avoid by every means we can think of. The least therefore that we must do is to await the result of the experiment I personally wish to conduct. It is a new thing and surely simple prudence requires us to watch that experiment. Indeed if aggressive civil disobedience whether mass or individual is attempted in other parts of India, it is likely to embarrass me and damage the country's cause. I invite the attention of all

non-co-operators to the resolution of the Working Committee which now makes it incumbent upon all the Congress organisations to refrain from aggressive civil disobedience except with my express consent and so far as I can see, the only exception I am likely to make will be in favour of a group of 100 villages in Andhradesha. But even there I have informed St. Konda Venkatapayya that if it is at all possible for him to avoid taking the offensive, I would appreciate it and that he would resort to it only if he found that retracing would be demoralising and if humanly speaking he was certain of non-violence being observed throughout Andhradesha and also certain that the other conditions laid down by the Congress were strictly fulfilled. I have a suspicion that in many parts of India the condition about the hand-spun *khadi* is not being strictly carried out and that we are not yet everywhere cured of the disease of untouchability. In my opinion the ability to go to jail is of far less consequence than ability and the readiness to observe in their fulness the conditions about Hindu-Muslim-Sikh-Parsi-Christian unity, about untouchability and handspun *khadi*. Without a due fulfilment of these conditions, we shall find that all our going to jail is bravado and so much wasted effort. Self-purification is the main consideration in seeking the prison. Embarrassment of the Government is a secondary consideration. It is my unalterable conviction that even though the Government may not feel embarrassed in any way whatsoever by the incarceration or even execution of an innocent, unknown, but a purified person, such incarceration will be the end of that Government. Even a single lamp dispells the deepest

darkness. Non-co-operation is not allopathic treatment, it is homeopathic. The patient does not taste the drops given to him. He is sometimes even incredulous, but if the homeopaths are to be trusted, the tasteless drops or the tiny pills of homeopathy are far more potent than ounce doses or choking pills of allopathy. I assure the reader that the effect of purifying non-co-operation is more certain than the effect of homeopathic medicine. I do wish, therefore, that everywhere non-co-operators will insist upon due fulfilment of all the conditions of civil disobedience. One may be a lawyer, title-holder, even a councillor and yet properly eligible for civil disobedience if he is sincerely non-violent in thought, word and deed, wears handspun khadi as a sacred duty, shuns untouchability as an intolerable evil and believes in the unity of all races and classes of India, as for all time essential for the well-being and the attainment, as also retention, of Swaraj.

It is now necessary to understand the exact distinction between aggressive civil disobedience and defensive. assertive or offensive civil disobedience is non-violent, wilful disobedience of laws of the state whose breach does not involve moral turpitude and which is undertaken as a symbol of revolt against the state. Thus disregard of laws relating to revenue or regulation of personal conduct for the convenience of the state, although such laws in themselves inflict no hardship and do not require to be altered, would be assertive, aggressive or offensive civil disobedience.

Defensive civil disobedience, on the other hand, is involuntary or reluctant non-violent disobedience of such laws as are in themselves bad and obedience to which

would be inconsistent with one's self-respect or human dignity. Thus formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, holding of public meetings for like purposes, publication of articles not contemplating or inciting to violence in spite of prohibitory orders is defensive civil disobedience. And so is conducting of peaceful picketing undertaken with a view to wean people from things or institutions picketed in spite of orders to the contrary. The fulfilment of the conditions mentioned above is as necessary for defensive civil disobedience as for offensive civil disobedience.

THE CRIME OF CHAURI CHAURA

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 16, 1922.)

God has been abundantly kind to me. He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that truthful and non-violent atmosphere which and which alone can justify mass disobedience which can be at all described as civil which means gentle, truthful, humble, knowing, wilful yet loving, never criminal and hateful.

He warned me in 1919 when the Rowlatt Act agitation was started. Ahmedabad, Viramgam, and Kheda erred : Amritsar and Kasur erred. I retraced my steps, called it a Himalayan miscalculation, humbled myself before God and man, and stopped not merely mass civil disobedience but even my own which I knew was intended to be civil and non-violent.

The next time it was through the events of Bombay

that God gave a terrific warning. He made me eyewitness of the deeds of the Bombay mob on the 17th November. The mob acted in the interest of non-co-operation. I announced my intention to stop the mass civil disobedience which was to be immediately started in Bardoli. The humiliation was greater than in 1919. But it did me good. I am sure that the nation gained by the stopping. India stood for truth and non-violence by the suspension.

But the bitterest humiliation was still to come. Madras did give the warning, but I heeded it not. But God spoke clearly through Chauri Chaura. I understand that the constables who were so brutally hacked to death had given much provocation. They had even gone back upon the word just given by the Inspector that they would not be molested, but when the procession has passed, the stragglers were interfered with and abused by the constables. The former cried out for help. The mob returned. The constables opened fire. The little ammunition they had was exhausted and they retired to the Thana for safety. The mob, my informant tells me, therefore set fire to the Thana. The self-imprisoned constables had to come out for dear life and as they did so, they were hacked to pieces and the mangled remains were thrown into the raging flames.

It is claimed that no non-co-operation volunteer had a hand in the brutality and that the mob had not only the immediate provocation but they had also general knowledge of the high-handed tyranny of the police in that district. No provocation can possibly justify the brutal murder of men who had been rendered defenceless and who had virtually thrown themselves on the mercy of

the mob. And when India claims to be non-violent and hopes to mount the throne of Liberty through non-violent means, mob-violence even in answer to grave provocation is a bad augury. Suppose the 'non-violent' disobedience of Bardoli was permitted by God to succeed, the Government had abdicated in favour of the victors of Bardoli, who would control the unruly element that must be expected to perpetrate inhumanity upon due provocation? Non-violent attainment of self-government presupposes a non-violent control over the violent elements in the country. Non-violent non-co-operators could only succeed when they have succeeded in attaining control over the hooligans of India, in other words, when the latter also have learnt patriotically or religiously to refrain from their violent activities, at least whilst the campaign of non-co-operation is going on. The tragedy at Chauri Chaura, therefore, roused me thoroughly.

'But what about your manifesto to the Viceroy and your rejoinder to his reply?' spoke the voice of Satan. It was the bitterest cup of humiliation to drink. 'Surely it is cowardly to withdraw the next day after pompous threats to the Government and promises to the people of Bardoli. Thus Satan's invitation was to deny Truth and therefore Religion, to deny God Himself. I put my doubts and troubles before the Working Committee and other associates whom I found near me. They did not all agree with me at first. Some of them probably do not even now agree with me. But never has a man been blessed, perhaps, with colleagues and associates so considerate and forgiving as I have. They understood my difficulty and patiently followed my argument. The

result is before the public in the shape of the resolutions of the Working Committee. The drastic reversal of practically the whole of the aggressive programme may be politically unsound and unwise, but there is no doubt that it is religiously sound, and I venture to assure the doubters that the country will have gained by my humiliation and confession of error.

The only virtue I want to claim is truth and non-violence. I lay no claim to superhuman powers. I want none. I wear the same corruptible flesh that the weakest of my fellow beings wears and am therefore as liable to err as any. My services have many limitations, but God has up to now blessed them in spite of the imperfections.

For, confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before. I feel stronger for my confession. And the cause must prosper for the retracing. Never has man reached his destination by persistence in deviation from the straight path.

It has been urged that Chauri Chaura cannot affect Bardoli. There is danger, it is argued, only if Bardoli is weak enough to be swayed by Chauri Chaura and is betrayed into violence. I have no doubt whatsoever on that account. The people of Bardoli are in my opinion the most peaceful in India. But Bardoli is but a speck on the map of India. Its effort cannot succeed unless there is perfect co-operation from the other parts. Bardoli's disobedience will be civil only when the other parts of India remain non-violent. Just as the addition of a grain of arsenic to a pot of milk renders it unfit as food, so will the civility of Bardoli prove unacceptable by the addition

of the deadly poison from Chauri Chaura. The latter represents India as much as Bardoli.

Chauri Chaura is after all an aggravated symptom. I have never imagined that there has been no violence, mental or physical, in the places where repression is going on. Only I have believed, I still believe and the pages of *Young India* amply prove, that the repression is out of all proportion to the insignificant popular violence in the areas of repression. The determined holding of meetings in prohibited areas I do not call violence. The violence I am referring to is the throwing of brickbats or intimidation and coercion practised in stray cases. As a matter of fact in civil disobedience there should be no excitement. Civil disobedience is a preparation for mute suffering. Its effect is marvellous though unperceived and gentle. But I regarded certain amount of excitement as inevitable, certain amount of unintended violence even pardonable, *i. e.*, I did not consider civil disobedience impossible in somewhat imperfect conditions. Under perfect conditions disobedience when civil is hardly felt. But the present movement is admittedly a dangerous experiment under fairly adverse conditions.

The tragedy of Chauri Chaura is really the index finger. It shows the way India may easily go, if drastic precautions be not taken. If we are not to evolve violence out of non-violence, it is quite clear that we must hastily retrace our steps and re-establish an atmosphere of peace, rearrange our programme and not think of starting mass civil disobedience until we are sure of peace being retained in spite of mass civil disobedience being started and in

spite of Government provocation. We must be sure of unauthorised portions not starting mass civil disobedience.

As it is, the Congress organisation is still imperfect and its instructions are still prefactorily carried out. We have not established Congress Committees in every one of the villages. Where we have, they are not perfectly amenable to our instructions. We have not probably more than one crore of members on the roll. We are in the middle of February, yet not many have paid the annual four annas subscription for the current year. Volunteers are indifferently enrolled. They do not conform to all the conditions of their pledge. They do not even wear hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar*. All the Hindu volunteers have not yet purged themselves of the sin of untouchability. All are not free from the taint of violence. Not by their imprisonment are we going to win Swaraj or serve the holy cause of the Khilafat or attain the ability to stop payment to faithless servants. Some of us err in spite of ourselves. But some others among us sin wilfully. They join volunteer corps well knowing that they are not and do not intend to remain non-violent. We are thus untruthful even as we hold the Government to be untruthful. We dare not enter the kingdom of Liberty with mere lip homage to truth and non-violence.

Suspension of mass civil disobedience and subsidence of excitement are necessary for further progress, indeed indispensable to prevent further retrogression. I hope, therefore, that by suspension every Congressman or woman will not only not feel disappointed, but he or she will feel relieved of the burden of unreality and of national sin.

Let the opponent glory in our humiliation or so called defeat. It is better to be charged with cowardice and weakness than to be guilty of denial of our oath and sin against God, It is million times better to *appear* untrue before the world than to *be* untrue to ourselves.

And so for me the suspension of mass civil disobedience and other minor activities that were calculated to keep up excitement is not enough penance for my having been the instrument, howsoever involuntary, of the brutal violence by the people at Chauri Chaura.

I must undergo personal cleansing. I must become a fitter instrument able to register the slightest variation in the moral atmosphere about me. My prayers must have much deeper truth and humility about them than they evidence. And for me there is nothing so helpful and cleansing as a fast accompanied by the necessary mental co-operation.

I know that the mental attitude is every thing. Just as a prayer may be merely a mechanical intonation as of a bird so a fast be a mere mechanical torture of the flesh so. Such mechanical contrivances are valueless for the purpose intended. Again just as a mechanical chant may result in the modulation of voice, a mechanical fast may result in purifying the body. Neither will touch the soul within.

But a fast undertaken for fuller self-expression, for attainment of the spirit's supremacy over the flesh, is a most powerful factor in one's evolution. After deep consideration, therefore, I am imposing on myself a five days' continuous fast permitting myself water. It commenced on Sunday evening, it ends on Friday evening. This is the least I must do.

I have taken into consideration the All-India Congress Committee meeting in front of me. I have in mind the anxious pain even the five days fast will cause many friends ; but I can no longer postpone the penance nor lessen it.

I urge co-workers not to copy my example. The motive in their case will be lacking. They are not the originators of civil disobedience. I am in the unhappy position of a surgeon proved skillless to deal with an admittedly dangerous case. I must either abdicate or acquire greater skill. Whilst the personal penance is not only necessary but obligatory on me, the exemplary self-restraint prescribed by the Working Committee is surely sufficient penance for every one else. It is no small penance and if sincerely carried out, it can become infinitely more real and better than fasting. What can be richer and more fruitful than a greater fulfilment of the vow of non-violence in thought, word, and deed or the spread of that spirit ? It will be more than food for me during that week to observe that comrades are all silently and without idle discussion, engaged in fulfilling the constructive programme sketched by the Working Committee, in enlisting Congress members after making sure that they understand the Congress creed of truth and non-violence for the attainment of Swaraj, in daily and religiously spinning for a fixed time, in introducing the wheel of prosperity and freedom in every home, in visiting 'untouchable' homes and finding out their wants, in inducing national schools to receive 'untouchable' children, in organising social service specially designed to find a common platform for every variety of man and

woman, and in visiting the homes which the drink curse is desolating, in establishing real *Panchayats* and in organising national schools on a proper footing. The workers will be better engaged in these activities than in fasting. I hope, therefore, that no one will join me in fasting, either through false sympathy or an ignorant conception of the spiritual value of fasting.

All fasting and all penance must as far as possible be secret. But my fasting is both a penance and a punishment, and a punishment has to be public. It is penance for me and punishment for those whom I try to serve, for whom I love to live and would equally love to die. They have unintentionally sinned against the laws of the Congress though they were sympathisers if not actually connected with it. Probably they hacked the constables, their countrymen and fellow beings, with my name on their lips. The only way love punishes is by suffering. I cannot even wish them to be arrested. But I would let them know that I would suffer for their breach of the Congress creed. I would advise those who feel guilty and repentant to hand themselves voluntarily to the Government for punishment and make a clean confession. I hope that the workers in the Gorakhpur district will leave no stone unturned to find out the evil-doers and urge them to deliver themselves into custody. But whether the murderers accept my advice or not, I would like them to know that they have seriously interfered with Swaraj operations, that in being the cause of the postponement of the movement in Bardoli, they have injured the very cause they probably intended to serve. I would like them to know, too, that this movement is not

a cloak or a preparation for violence. I would, at any rate, suffer every humiliation, every torture, absolute ostracism and death itself to prevent the movement from becoming violent or a precursor of violence. I make my penance public also because I am now denying myself the opportunity of sharing their lot with the prisoners. The immediate issue has again shifted, we can no longer press for the withdrawal of notifications or discharge of prisoners. They and we must suffer for the crime of Chauri Chaura. The incident proves, whether we wish it or no, the unity of life, all, including even the administrators, must suffer. Chauri Chaura must stiffen the Government, must still further demoralise the people. The suspension and the penance will take us back to the position we occupied before the tragedy. By strict discipline and purification we regain the moral confidence required for demanding the withdrawal of notifications and the discharge of prisoners.

If we learn the full lesson of the tragedy we can turn the course into a blessing. By becoming truthful and non-violent, both in spirit and deed, and by making the swadeshi *i. e.*, the *khaddar* programme complete, we can establish full Swaraj and redress the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs without a single person having to offer civil disobedience.

I HAVE LOST ALL CREDIT

BY M. K. GANDHI

(February 23, 1921)

A friend from Lahore without giving his name sends me the following thundering note:—

“On Tuesday the 14th I read the *Tribune* and the resolutions therein, passed at the emergency meeting of the All-India Congress Working Committee. On Monday when I came from my office I heard a flying rumour that Mahatmaji had postponed the date of the mass civil disobedience, but at that time I thought the news was devoid of foundation. After a short time a friend of mine hawked me at my house and we went to bazaar. His face was somewhat sadder than usual. I enquired of him the reason of his sadness. He said he was utterly disgusted and so gave up the idea of following this movement. Mahatmaji was going to give up the lead of this movement and at the same time he had advised all the Provincial Congress Committees not to enrol any more volunteers. No picketing propaganda should be undertaken as long as the special session of the All-India Congress Committee had not confirmed what to do further.

“The people are of this opinion that you have turned your face and become fickle-minded. They will co-operate with the Government without any hesitation and join the ceremony of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. Some say that they will not observe *hartal* and will accord a hearty reception at Lahore.

“Some merchants are under the impression that you

have removed all the restriction from all liquor shops and *wideshi* cloth.

“ Truly speaking, each and every one in Lahore city is holding meeting in the bazaar as well as in the house, and you will forgive me if I will say boldly that they are condemning the action of the All-India Congress Committee.

“ I now for my sake ask you these questions.

“ (1) Will you now give up the lead of this movement? If so, why?

“ (2) Will you be good enough to let me know why you have given such instructions to all Provincial Congress Committees? Have you given an opportunity to Pandit Malaviya for a Round Table Conference for a settlement, or has Pandit Malaviya agreed to embrace your movement in case the Government has not turned true to its words?

“ (3) Grant a compromise is arranged and the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are redressed and in the case of Swaraj the Government may only extend the reforms, will you be satisfied with that or continue your activities till you have got the full dominion status?

“ (4) Suppose no decision is arrived at. Will Pandit Malaviya and all others who are connected with this conference come to your side or will their fate remain in the balance just as now?

“ (5) In case no decision is arrived at, will you give up the idea of civil disobedience, if there is danger of violence.

“ (6) Is your intention now to discard the present volunteer corps and enlist those who know spinning and wear handspun and handwoven *khaddar*?

“ (7) Suppose violence had made appearance when you have started your mass civil disobedience, what will you do at that time ? Will you stop your activities at the very moment ? ”

There is much more criticism in this letter than I have reproduced. The writer tells me that the people are so disgusted that they now threaten to become co-operators and are of opinion that have sold Lala Lajpat Rai, Desha-bandhu Chitta Ranjan Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, the Ali Brothers and others, and tells me that if I give up the leadership there are thousands who will leave this world by committing suicide. I may assure the citizens of Lahore in particular and the Punjabis in general that I do not believe what is said of them. I used to receive such letters even during the Martial Law days because of the suspension of civil disobedience, but I discounted all the news and on my reaching the Punjab in October, I found that I was right in my analysis of the Punjab mind and I discovered that there was no one to challenge the propriety of my act. I feel still more confident of the correctness of the decision of the Working Committee, but if it is found that the country repudiates my action I shall not mind it. I can but do my duty. A leader is useless when he acts against the promptings of his own conscience, surrounded as he must be by people holding all kinds of views. He will drift like an anchorless ship if he has not the inner voice to hold him firm and guide him. Above all, I can easily put up with the denial of the world, but any denial by me of my God is unthinkable, and if I did not give at this critical period of the struggle of the

advice that I have, I would be denying both God and Truth. The telegrams and letters I am receiving from all parts of the country thanking me for my decision—telegrams from both non-co-operators and co-operators—confirm my belief that the country appreciates the decision and that the Lahore writer has given undue prominence to some heated bazaar talk which was bound to take place after the Bardoli decision which all of a sudden disturbed all previous calculations. I can understand the effect of the first shock, but I am also sure that when the people begin to analyse the implications of non-violence, they will come to no other conclusion than that of the Working Committee.

And now for the questions of the correspondent.

(1) I am not likely to give up the lead of the movement unless I have a clear indication that the people want me to. One method of giving that indication is an adverse vote of the Working Committee or the All-India Congress Committee.

(2) I assure the public that Pandit Malaviyaji had absolutely no hand in shaping my decision. I have often yielded to Panditji, and it is always a pleasure for me to yield to him whenever I can and always painful to differ from one who has an unrivalled record of public service and who is sacrifice personified. But so far as the decision of suspension is concerned, I arrived at it on my reading the detailed report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy in the *Chronicle*. It was in Bardoli that telegrams were sent convening the Working Committee meeting and it was in Bardoli that I sent a letter to the members of the Working Committee advising.

them of my desire to suspend civil disobedience. I went thereafter to Bombay at the instance of Panditji, who together with the other friends of the Malaviya Conference, undoubtedly wished to plead with me for a suspension and who were agreeable surprised when I told them that so far I was concerned my mind was made up, that I had kept it open so that I could discuss the point thoroughly with the members of the Working Committee. The suspension has no reference to a round table conference or to any settlement. In my opinion, a round table conference is bound to prove fruitless. It requires a much stronger Viceroy than Lord Reading has proved to be to perceive the situation in the country and then to describe it correctly. I certainly feel that Pandit Malaviyaji has already come into the movement. It is not possible for him to keep away from the Congress or from danger, but the Bardoli decision was arrived at purely on its merits and I could not have been shaken from the original purpose had I not been unnerved by the Chauri Chaura tragedy which was the last straw.

(3) Nothing short of a full Dominion status is likely to satisfy me personally; nothing short of complete severance will satisfy me if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs remain unredressed, but the exact form does not depend upon me. I have no clear-cut scheme. It has to be evolved by the people's representatives.

(4) At the present moment there is no question of a settlement. Therefore, the question as to what Panditji and all others will do is premature if not irrelevant. But assuming that Panditji holds any conference and that its resolutions are ignored by the Government, Panditji and

others will act as all self-respecting men do in such circumstances.

(5) I can never give up the *idea* of civil disobedience, no matter what danger there is of violence, but I shall certainly give up the idea of *starting* mass civil disobedience so long as there is a certain danger of violence. Individual civil disobedience stands on a different footing.

(6) There is no question of disbanding any Volunteer Corps, but the names of those who do not conform to the Congress pledge have certainly to be removed from the list if we are to be honest.

(7) If we have understood the essential parts of non-violence, we can but come to one conclusion that any eruption of widespread violence and I call the Chauri Chaura tragedy widespread for the purpose automatically stops mass civil disobedience. That many other parts of the country have nobly responded to the spirit of non-violence is good, but it is not good enough to continue mass civil disobedience even as a most *peaceful* meeting is disturbed if one man obstructs or commits violence. Mass civil disobedience for becoming successful requires a non-violent environment. The reason for restricting it to one single small area is to prevent violence elsewhere. It, therefore, means that mass civil disobedience in a particular area is possible when the other areas passively co-operate by remaining non-violent.

THE ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 2, 1922.)

The session, just past, of the All-India Congress Committee, was in some respects more memorable than the Congress. There is so much under-current of violence, both conscious and unconscious, that I was actually and literally praying for a disastrous defeat. I have always been in a minority. The reader does not know that in South Africa I stated with practical unanimity, reached a minority of sixty-four and even sixteen and went up again to a huge majority. The best and the most solid work was done in the wilderness of minority.

I know that the only thing that the Government dread is this huge majority I seem to command. They little know that I dread it even more than they. I have become literally sick of the adoration of the unthinking multitude. I would feel certain of my ground, if I was spat upon by them. Then there would be no need for confession of Himalayan and other miscalculation, no retracing, no re-arranging.

But it was not to be.

A friend warned me against exploiting my dictatorship. He little knew that I had never once used it, if only because the legal occasion had not yet arisen for its use. The 'dictatorship' accrues to me only when the ordinary Congress machinery is rendered unworkable by the Government.

Far from my consciously or unconsciously exploiting

my 'dictatorship', I have begun to wonder if I am not unconsciously allowing myself to 'be 'exploited'. I confess that I have a dread of it such as I never had before. My only safety lies in my shamelessness. I have warned my friends of the Committee that I am incorrigible. I shall continue to confess blunders each time the people commit them. The only tyrant I accept in this world is the still small voice within. And even though I have to face the prospect of a minority of one, I humbly believe I have the courage to be in such a hopeless minority. That to me is the only truthful position.

But I am a sadder and I hope, a wiser man to-day. I see that our non-violence is skin-deep. We are burning with indignation. The Government is feeding it by its insensate acts. It seems almost as if the Government wants to see this land covered with murder, arson and rapine, in order to be able once more to claim exclusive ability to put them down.

This non-violence therefore seems to be due merely to our helplessness. It almost appears as if we are nursing in our bosoms the desire to make revenge the first time we get the opportunity,

Can true voluntary non-violence come out of this seeming forced non-violence of the weak? Is it not a futile experiment I am conducting? What if, when the fury bursts, not a man, woman or child is safe and every man's hand is raised against his fellow being? Of what avail is it then if I fast myself to death in the event of such a catastrophe coming to pass?

What is the alternative? To lie and say that what I know to be evil, is good? To say that true and voluntary

co-operation will come out of false and forced co-operation is to say that light will result from darkness.

Co-operation with the Government is as much a weakness and a sin as alliance with suspended violence.

The difficulty is almost insurmountable. Hence with the growing knowledge of the fact that this non-violence is merely superficial, I must continually make mistakes and retrace, even as a man wading his way through a tractless forest must continually stop, retrace, stumble, be hurt and even bleed.

I was prepared for a certain amount of depression, disappointment and resentment, but I confess I was totally unprepared for the hurricane of opposition. It became clear to me that the workers were in no mood to do any serious work of construction. The constructive programme lent no enchantment. They were not a social reform association. They could not wrest power from the Government by such humdrum reform work. They wanted to deliver non-violent blows! All this appeared to be thoroughly unreal. They would not stop to think that even if they could defeat the Government by a childish display of rage, they could not conduct the government of the country for a single day without serious and laborious organisation and construction.

We must not go to gaol, as Mahomed Ali would say, in a false issue?. It is not *any* imprisonment that will lead to Swaraj. It is not *every* disobedience that will fire us with the spirit of obedience and discipline. Jails, are no gate-way to liberty for the confirmed criminal. They are temples of liberty only for those who are innocence personified. The execution of Socrates

made immortality a living reality for us,—not so the execution of countless murderers. There is no warrant for supposing that we can steal Swaraj by the imprisonment of thousands of nominally non-violent men with hatred, ill-will and violence raging in their breasts.

It would be otherwise if we were fighting with arms, giving and receiving blow for blow. The imprisonment of those who may be caught intimidating, assaulting and murdering will certainly embarrass the Government and when they are tired, they would as elsewhere yield. But such is not our fight to-day. Let us be truthful. If it is through 'show of force' that we wish to gain Swaraj, let us drop non-violence and offer such violence as we may. It would be a manly, honest and sober attitude—an attitude the world has been used to for ages past. No one can then accuse us of the terrible charge of hypocrisy.

But the majority will not listen to me. In spite of all my warnings and passionate plea for rejecting my resolution, if they did not believe in non-violence as indispensable for the attainment of our goal, they accepted it without a single material change. I would ask them therefore to realise their responsibility. They are now bound not to rush to civil disobedience but to settle down to the quiet work of construction. I would urge them to be indifferent to the clamour for immediate action. The immediate action is not courting imprisonment, nor even free speech and free association or free pen, but self-purification, introspection, quite organisation. We have lost our foothold. If we do not take care, we are likely to be drowned in the waters whose depth we do not know.

It is no use thinking of the prisoners. When I heard of Chauri Chaura I sacrificed them as the first penitential act. They have gone to jail to be released only by the strength of the people, indeed the hope was, the Swaraj Parliament's first act would be to open the prison gates. God had decreed otherwise. We who are outside have tried and failed. The prisoners can now only gain by serving the full term of their imprisonment. Those who went under pretences also or under any misapprehension or under a mistaken understanding of the movement can come out by apologising and by petitioning. The movement will be all the stronger for the purging. The stoutest hearts will rejoice in the opportunity of unexpectedly greater suffering. Though thousands of Russians have 'rotted' in the Russian prisons for years and years, that unhappy people are not yet free. Liberty is a jilt most difficult to woo and please. We have shown the power of suffering. But we have not suffered enough. If the people in general keep passively non-violent and if only a few are actively, honestly and knowingly non-violent in intent, word and deed, we can reach the goal in quickest time with the least suffering. But we shall indefinitely postpone the attainment, if we send to prison men who harbour violence in their breasts.

Therefore the duty of the majority in their respective provinces is to face taunts, insults and if need be depletion in their ranks but determinedly to pursue their goal without swerving an inch. The authorities mistaking our suspension for weakness may resort to still greater oppression. We should submit to it. We should even abandon de-

fensive civil disobedience and concentrate all our energy on the tasteless but health-giving economic and social reform. We should bend down on our knees and assure the moderates that they need fear no harm from us. We should assure the zamindars that we have no ill-will against them.

The average Englishman is haughty, he does not understand us, he considers himself to be a superior being. He thinks that he is born to rule us. He relies upon his forts or his gun to protect himself. He despises us. He wants to compel co-operation i.e., slavery. Even him we have to conquer, not by bending the knee, but remaining aloof from him, but at the same time not hating him nor hurting him. It is cowardly to molest him. If we simply refuse to regard ourselves as his slaves and pay homage to him, we have done our duty. A mouse can only shun the cat. He cannot treat with her till she has filed the points of her claws and teeth. At the same time we must show every attention to those few Englishmen who are trying to cure themselves and fellow Englishmen of the disease of race superiority.

The minority has different ideals. It does not believe in the programme. Is it not right and patriotic for them to form a new party and a new organisation? They will then truly educate the country. Those who do not believe in the creed should surely retire from the Congress. Even a national organisation must have a creed. One, for instance, who does not believe in Swaraj has no place in the Congress. I submit that even so has one who does not believe in 'peaceful and legitimate means' no place in the Congress.

A Congressman may not believe in non-co-operation and still remain in it but he cannot believe in violence and untruth and still be a Congressman. I was therefore deeply hurt when I found opposition to the note in the resolution about the creed and still more when I found opposition to my paraphrase of the adjectives 'peaceful' and 'legitimate' into 'non-violent' and 'truthful' respectively. I had reasons for the paraphrase. I was seriously told that the creed did not insist upon non-violence and truth as the indispensable means for the attainment of Swaraj. I agreed to remove the paraphrase in order to avoid a painful discussion but I felt that truth was stabbed.

I am sure that those who raised this opposition are as patriotic as I claim to be, they are as eager for Swaraj as every other Congressman. But I do say that the patriotic spirit demands their loyal and strict adherence to non-violence and truth and that if they do not believe in them, they should retire from the Congress organisations.

Is it not national economy to let all the ideals be sharply defined and to work independently of one another? That then which is most popular will win the day. If we are going to evolve the real spirit of democracy, we shall not do to by obstruction but by abstention.

The session of the All-India Congress Committee was a forcible demonstration of the fact that *we* are retarding the country's progress towards Swaraj and not the Government. Every mistake of the Government helps. Every neglect of duty on our part hinders.

NEEDLESS NERVOUSNESS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 2, 1922.)

I am sorry that I find a nervous fear among some Hindus and Mahomedans that I am undermining their faith and that I am even doing irreparable harm to India by my uncompromising preaching of non-violence. They seem almost to imply that violence is their creed. I touch a tender spot if I talk about extreme non-violence in their presence. They confound me with texts from the Mahabharata and the Koran enlogising or permitting violence. Of the Mahabharata I can write without restraint, but the most devout Mahomedan will not, I hope, deny me the privilege of understanding the message of the Prophet. I make bold to say that violence is the creed of no religion and that whereas non-violence in most cases is obligatory in all, violence is merely permissible in some cases. But I have not put before India the final form of non-violence. The non-violence that I have preached from Congress platforms is non-violence as a policy. But even policies require honest adherence in thought, word and deed. If I believe that honesty is the best policy, surely whilst I so believe, I must be honest in thought, word and deed, for otherwise I become an imposter. Non-violence being a policy means that it can upon due notice be given up when it proves unsuccessful or ineffective. But simple morality demands that whilst a particular policy is pursued, it must be pursued with all one's heart. It is simple policy to march along a certain route,

but the soldier who marches with an unsteady step along that route is liable to be summarily dismissed. I become therefore incredulous when people talk to me sceptically about non-violence or are seized with fright at the very mention of the word non-violence. If they do not believe in the expedient of non-violence, they must denounce it but not claim to believe in the expedient when their heart resists it. How disastrous it would be, if not believing in violence even as an expedient, I joined, say, a violence party and approached a gun with a perturbed heart! The reader will believe me when I say that I have the capacity for killing a fly. But I do not believe in killing even flies. Now suppose I joined an expedition for fly-killing as an expedient. Will I not be expected before being permitted to join the expedition to use all the available engines of destruction whilst I remained in the army of fly-killers? If those who are in the Congress and the Khilafat Committees will perceive this simple truth, we shall certainly either finish the struggle this year to a successful end or be so sick of non-violence as to give up the pretension and set about devising some other programme.

I hold that Swami Shraddhanandji has been needlessly criticised for the proposition he intended to move. His argument is absolutely honest. He thinks that we as a body do not really believe in non-violence even as a policy. Therefore we shall never fulfil the programme of non-violence. Therefore, he says, let us go to the Councils and get what crumbs we may. He was trying to show the unreality of the position of those who believe in the policy with their lips, whereas they are looking forward to violence for final deliverance. I do say that if Congress-

men do not fully *believe* in the policy, they are doing an injury to the country by pretending to follow it. If violence is to be basis of future government, the Councilors are undoubtedly the wisest. For it is through the Councils that, by the same devices by which the present administrators rule us, the Councillors hope to seize power from the former's hands. I have little doubt that those who nurse violence in their bosoms will find no benefit from the lip profession of non-violence. I urge, therefore, with all the vehemence at my command that those who do not believe in non-violence should secede from the Congress and from non-co-operation and prepare to seek election or rejoin law courts or Government colleges as the case may be. Let there be no manner of doubt that Swaraj established by non-violent means will be different in kind from the Swaraj that can be established by armed rebellion. Police and punishments there will be even under such Swaraj. But there would be no room for brutalities such as we witness to-day both on the part of the people and the Government. And those, whether they call themselves Hindus or Mussalmans, who do not fully believe in the policy of non-violence, should abandon both non-co-operation and non-violence.

For me, I am positive that neither in the Koran nor in the Mahabharata there is any sanction for and approval of the triumph of violence. Though there is repulsion enough in nature, she *lives* by attraction. Mutual loves enables nature to persist. Man does not live destruction. Self-love compels regard for others. Nations cohere because there is mutual regard among the individuals com-

posing them. Some day we must extend the nation law to the universe, even as we have intended the family law to form nations—of larger family. God has ordained that India should be such a nation. For so far as reason can perceive, India cannot become free by armed rebellion for generations, India can become free by refraining from national violence. India has now become tired of rule based upon violence. That to me is the message of the plains. The people of the plains do not know what it is to put up an organised armed fight. And they must become free, for they want freedom. They have realised that power seized by violence will only result in their greater grinding.

Such at any rate is the reasoning that has given birth to the *policy*, not the *dharma*, of non-violence. And even as a Mussalman or a Hindu believing in violence applies the creed of non-violence in his family, so are both called upon without question to apply the policy of non-violence in their mutual relations and in their relation to other races and classes not excluding Englishmen. Those who do not believe in this policy and do not wish to live up to it in full, retard the movement by remaining in it.

It is thus clear what I would like the Provincial organisations to do. They must not for the present disobey the Government orders so far as it is at all possible. They must not, before they have searched their hearts, take forward action but bring about an absolutely calm atmosphere. No imprisonment courted in anger has availed us anything. I agree with the Mussalman view which is also the Hindu view that there is no imprisonment for the sake of it. All imprisonment to be useful has to be

courted for religion or country and that by men and women clad in *khaddar* and without anger or violence in their hearts. If the provinces have no such men and women, they should not embark on civil disobedience at all.

Hence it is that the constructive programme has been framed. It will steady and calm us. It will wake our organising spirit, it will make us industrious, it will render us fit for Swaraj, it will cool our blood. We shall be spat upon, laughed at, sworn at, may be even kicked and cursed. We must put up with it all inasmuch as we have harboured anger in our breasts even though we have been under the pledge of non-violence. I must frankly state that unless we can retrieve our steps deliberately, cultivate non-violence and manufacture *khaddar*, we cannot render effective help to the Khilafat, we cannot get redress of the Punjab wrong, nor can we attain Swaraj. My leadership is perfectly useless if I cannot convince co-workers and the public of the absolute and immediate necessity of vigorously prosecuting the constructive programme.

We must know whether we can get a crore of men and women in all India who believe in the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful *i. e.*, non-violent and legitimate *i. e.*, truthful means. We will know how many people there are in India who are willing honestly to pay one rupee out of every hundred of their past year's income to the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund. This subscription the Committee expects from Congressmen and sympathisers.

We must spend money like water in introducing the spinning wheel in every home, in the manufacture and the distribution of *khaddar* wherever required.

Surely we have long neglected the 'untouchable' brother. He has slaved for us too long. We must now serve him.

Our liquor picketing has done some good but not substantial. Not till we pierce the homes of the drunkard shall we make any real advance. We must know why we drink ; what we can substitute for it. We must have a census of all the drunkards of India.

Social Service Department has been looked at with the utmost contempt. If the non-co-operation movement is not malicious, that department is a necessity. We want to render alike to friend and foe service in times of distress. We are thereby able to keep our relations sweet with all in spite of our political aloofness.

Social service and temperance reform were laughed at as part of the struggle for Swaraj. It was a painful exhibition of ignorance of the essentials of Swaraj. I claim that human mind or human society is not divided into water-tight compartments called social, political and religious. All act and react upon one another. What is more, the vast majority of Hindus and Mussalmans have joined the struggle believing it to be religious. The masses have come in because they want to save the Khilafat and the cow. Deprive the Mussalman of the hope of helping the Khilafat and he will shun the Congress ; tell the Hindu he cannot save the cow if he joins the Congress, he will to a man leave it. To laugh at moral reform and social service is to laugh at Swaraj, the Khilafat and the Punjab.

Even the organisation of schools was laughed at. Let us see what it means. We have demolished the prestige of Government schools. It was perhaps necessary in 1920

to do the picketing and certainly not to mind the boys being neglected, but it would be criminal any longer to picket Government schools or to neglect National institutions. We can now only draw more boys and girls by putting existing national schools on a better footing. They have the advantage of being in institutions where they breathe free air and where they are not shadowed. But the advantage of scientific training in carding, hand-spinning and hand-weaving and of having intellectual training in keeping with the requirements of the country must be added. We shall show by successful experiment the superiority of training in National schools and colleges.

Even the *Panchayats* came in for ridicule. Little did the critics realise that the masses in many parts of India had ceased to resort to law courts. If we do not organise honest *Panchayats*, they will certainly go back to the existing law courts.

Nor is a single step devoid of vast political results. Adequate manufacture and universal use of *khaddar* means a permanent boycott of foreign cloth, and automatic distribution of sixty crores of rupees annually among the poor people. Permanent disappearance of the drink and the opium evils mean an annual saving of seventeen crores to the people and a diminution of that revenue for the Government. Constructive effort for the untouchables means the addition to the Congress ranks of six crores of men and women who will for ever be bound to the Congress Social Service Department, if it becomes a live thing, it will restore the strained relations that exist to-day among co-operators (whether Indian or English) and non-

co-operators. To work the full constructive programme therefore is to achieve all we want. To fail in fulfilling the programme is to postpone all possibility of effective civil disobedience.

IF I AM ARRESTED—

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 9, 1922.*)

The rumour has been revived that my arrest is imminent. It is said to be regarded as a mistake by some officials that I was not arrested when I was to be, *i. e.*, on the 11th or 12th of February and that the Bardoli decision ought not to have been allowed to affect the Government's programme. It is said, too, that it is now no longer possible for the Government to withstand the ever rising agitation in London for my arrest and deportation. I myself cannot see how the Government can avoid arresting me if they want a permanent abandonment of civil disobedience whether individual or mass.

I advised the Working Committee to suspend mass civil disobedience at Bardoli because that disobedience would not have been civil, and if I am now advising all provincial workers to suspend even individual civil disobedience, it is because I know that any disobedience at the present stage will be not civil but criminal. A tranquil atmosphere is an indispensable condition of civil disobedience. It is humiliating for me to discover that there is a spirit of violence abroad and that the Government of the United Provinces has been obliged to enlist

additional police for avoiding a repetition of Chauri Chaura. I do not say that all that is claimed to have happened has happened, but it is impossible to ignore all the testimony that is given in proof of the growing spirit of violence in some parts of those provinces. In spite of my political differences with Pundit Hridayanath Kunzru, I regard him to be above wilful perversion of truth. I consider him to be one of the most capable among public workers. He is not a man to be easily carried away. When, therefore, he gives an opinion upon anything, it immediately arrests my attention. Making due allowance for the colouring of his judgment by reason of his pro-Government attitude, I am unable to dismiss his report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy as unworthy of consideration. Nor is it possible to ignore letters received from Zamindars and others informing me of the violent temperament and ignorant lawlessness in the United Provinces. I have before me the Bareilly report signed by the Congress Secretary. Whilst the authorities behaved like mad men and forgot themselves in their fit of anger, we are not, if that report is to be believed, without fault. The volunteer procession was not a civil demonstration. It was insisted upon in spite of a sharp division of opinion in our own ranks. Though the crowds that gathered were not violent, the spirit of the demonstration was undoubtedly violent. It was an impotent show of force wholly unnecessary for our purpose and hardly a prelude to civil disobedience. That the authorities could have handled the procession in a better spirit, that they ought not to have interfered with the Swaraj flag, that they ought not to have objected to the

use of the Town Hall which was town property to Congress offices in view of the fact that it had been so used for some months with the permission of the Town Council, is all very true. But we have ceased to give credit to the authorities for common or reasonable sense. On the contrary, we have set ourselves against them because we expect nothing but unreason and violence from them, and knowing that the authorities would act no better than than they did, we should have refrained from all the previous irritating demonstrations. That the U. P. Government are making a mountain out of a mole-hill, that they are discounting their own provocation and the provocation given by the murdered men at Chauri Chaura is nothing new. All that I am concerned with is that is not possible for us to claim that; we have given them no handle whatsoever. It is therefore as a penance that civil disobedience has been suspended. But if the atmosphere clears up, the people realise the full value of the adjective 'civil' and become in reality non-violent both in spirit and in deed, and if I find that the Government still do not yield to the people's will, I shall certainly be the first person to advocate individual or mass civil disobedience as the case may be. There is no escape from that duty without the people wishing to surrender their birthright.

I doubt the sincerity of Englishmen who are born fighters when they declaim against civil disobedience as if it was a diabolical crime to be punished with exemplary severity. If they have glorified armed rebellions and resorted to them on due occasions, why are many of them up in arms against the very idea of civil resistance? I can understand their saying that the attain-

ment of non-violent atmosphere is a virtual impossibility in India. I do not believe it, but I can appreciate such an objection. What, however, is beyond my comprehension is the deadset made against the very theory of civil disobedience as if it was something immoral. To expect me to give up the preaching of civil disobedience is to ask me to give up preaching peace, which would be tantamount to asking me to commit suicide.

I have now been told that the Government are compassing the destruction of the three weeklies which I am conducting, viz., *Young India*, *Gujarati Nava Jivan* and *Hindi Nava Jivan*. I hope that the rumour has no foundation. I claim that these three journals are insistently preaching nothing but peace and good-will. Extraordinary care is taken to give nothing but truth as I find it, to the readers. Every inadvertent inaccuracy is admitted and corrected. The circulation of all the weeklies is daily growing. The conductors are voluntary workers, in some cases taking no salary whatsoever and in the others receiving mere maintenance money. Profits are all returned to the subscribers in some shape or other, or are utilised for some constructive public activity or other. I cannot say that I shall not feel a pang if these journals cease to exist. But it is the easiest thing for the Government to put them out. The publishers and printers are all friends and co-workers. My compact with them is that the moment Government asks for security, that moment the newspapers must stop. I am conducting them upon the assumption that whatever view the Government may take of my activities, they at

least give me credit for preaching, through these newspapers, nothing but the purest non-violence and truth according to my lights.

I hope, however, that whether the Government arrest me or whether they stop by direct or indirect means the publication of the three journals, the public will remain unmoved. It is a matter of no pride or pleasure to me but one of humiliation that the Government refrain from arresting me for fear of an outbreak of universal violence and awful slaughter that any such outbreak must involve. It would be a sad commentary upon my preaching of, and upon the Congress and Khilafat pledge of, non-violence, if my incarceration was to be a signal for a storm all over the country. Surely, it would be a demonstration of India's unreadiness for a peaceful rebellion. It would be a triumph for the bureaucracy, and it would be almost a final proof of the correctness of the position taken up by the Moderate friends, *viz.*, that India can never be prepared for non-violent disobedience. I hope therefore that the Congress and Khilafat workers will strain every nerve and show that all the fears entertained by the Government and their supporters were totally wrong. I promise that such act of self-restraint will take us many a mile towards our triple goal.

There should therefore be no *hartals*, no noisy demonstrations, no processions. I would regard the observance of perfect peace on my arrest as a mark of high honour paid to me by my countrymen. What I would love to see, however, is the constructive work of the Congress going on with clockwork regularity and speed of the

Punjab Express. I would love to see people who have hitherto kept back, voluntarily discarding all their foreign cloth and making a bonfire of it. Let them fulfil the whole of the constructive programme framed at Bardoli, and they will not only release me and other prisoners, but they will also inaugurate Swaraj and secure redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. Let them remember the four pillars of Swaraj: Non-violence, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh-Parsi-Christian-Jew unity, total removal of untouchability and manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* completely displacing foreign cloth.

I do not know that my removal from their midst will not be a benefit to the people. In the first instance, the superstition about the possession of supernatural powers by me will be demolished. Secondly, the belief that people have accepted the non-co-operation programme only under my influence and that they have no independent faith in it will be disproved. Thirdly, our capacity for Swaraj will be proved by our ability to conduct our activities in spite of the withdrawal even of the originator of the current programme. Fourthly and selfishly, it will give me a quiet and physical rest, which perhaps I deserve.

THE GREAT SENTINEL*

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 13, 1921.)

The Bard of Shantiniketan has contributed to the *Modern Review* a brilliant essay * on the present move-

* Not included in this collection.

ment. It is a series of word pictures which he alone can paint. It is an eloquent protest against authority, slave mentality or whatever description one gives of blind acceptance of a passing mania whether out of fear or hope. It is a welcome and wholesome reminder to all workers, that we must not be impatient, we must not impose authority no matter how great. The poet tells us summarily to reject anything and everything that does not appeal to our reason or heart. If we would gain Swaraj, we must stand for Truth as we know it at any cost. A reformer who is enraged because his message is not accepted must retire to the forest to learn how to watch, wait and pray. With all this one must heartily agree, and the Poet deserves the thanks of his countrymen for standing up for Truth and Reason. There is no doubt that our last state will be worse than our first, if we surrender our reason into somebody's keeping. And I would feel extremely sorry to discover, that the country had unthinkingly and blindly followed all I had said or done. I am quite conscious of the fact that blind surrender to love is often more mischievous than a forced surrender to the lash of the tyrant. There is hope for the slave of the brute, none for that of love. Love is needed to strengthen the weak, love becomes tyrannical when it exacts obedience from an unbeliever. To mutter a *mantra* without knowing its value is unmanly. It is good, therefore, that the poet has invited all who are slavishly *mimicking* the call of the *charkha* boldly to declare their revolt. His essay serves as a warning to us all who in our impatience are betrayed into intolerance or even violence against those who differ from us. I regard the Poet as a sentinel warn

ing us against the approach of enemies called Bigotry, Lethargy, Intolerance, Ignorance, Inertia and other members of that brood.

But whilst I agree with all that the Poet has said as to the necessity of watchfulness lest we cease to think, I must not be understood to endorse the proposition that there is any such blind obedience on a large scale in the country to day. I have again and again appealed to reason, and let me assure him, that if happily the country has come to believe in the spinning-wheel as the giver of plenty, it has done so after laborious thinking, after great hesitation. I am not sure, that even now educated India has assimilated the truth underlying the *charlha*. He must not mistake the surface dirt for the substance underneath. Let him go deeper and see for himself, whether the *charlha* has been accepted from blind faith or from reasoned necessity.

I do indeed ask the Poet and the page to spin the wheel as a sacrament. When there is war, the poet lays down the lyre, the lawyer his law reports, the schoolboy his books. The Poet will sing the true note after the war is over, the lawyer will have occasion to go to his law books when people have time to fight among themselves. When a house is on fire, all the inmates go out, and each one takes up a bucket to quench the fire. When all about me are dying for want of food, the only occupation permissible to me is to feed the hungry. It is my conviction that India is a house on fire, because its manhood is being daily scorched, it is dying of hunger because it has no work to buy food with. Khulna is starving not because the people cannot work, but because they have no work

The Ceded Districts are passing successively through a fourth famine, Orissa is a land suffering from chronic famines. Our cities are not India. India lives in her seven and a half lacs of villages, and the cities live upon the villages. They do not bring their wealth from other countries. The city people are brokers and commission agents for the big houses of Europe, America and Japan. The cities have co-operated with the latter in the bleeding process that has gone on for the past two hundred years. It is my belief based on experience, that India is daily growing poorer. The circulation about her feet and legs has almost stopped. And if we do not take care, she will collapse altogether.

To a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food as wages. God created man to work for his food and said that those who ate without work were thieves. Eighty per cent of India are compulsorily thieves half the year. It is any wonder if India has become one vast prison? Hunger is the argument that is driving India to the spinning wheel. The call of the spinning wheel is the noblest of all. Because it is the call of love. And love is Swaraj. The spinning wheel will 'curb the mind' when time spent on necessary physical labour can be said to do so. We must think of millions who are to day less than animals, who are almost in a dying state. The spinning wheel is the reviving draught for the millions of our dying country men and country women. 'Why should I, who have no deed to work for food, spin?' may be the question asked. Because I am

eating what does not belong to me. I am living on the spoliation of my countrymen. Trace the course of every pice that finds its way into your pocket, and you will realise the truth of what I write. Swaraj has no meaning for the millions if they do not know how to employ their enforced idleness. The attainment of this Swaraj is possible within a short time, and it is so possible only by the revival of the spinning wheel.

I do want growth, I do want self-determination, I do want freedom, but I want all these for the soul. I doubt if the steel age is an advance upon the flint age. I am indifferent. It is the evolution of the soul to which the intellect and all our faculties have to be devoted. I have no difficulty in imagining the possibility of a man armoured after the modern style making some lasting and new discovery for mankind, but I have less difficulty in imagining the possibility of a man having nothing but a bit of flint and a nail for lighting his path or his matchlock ever singing new hymns of praise and delivering to an aching world a message of peace and goodwill upon earth. A plea for the spinning wheel is a plea for recognising the dignity of labour.

I claim that in losing the spinning wheel we lost our left lung. We are therefore suffering from galloping consumption. The restoration of the wheel arrests the progress of the fell disease. There are certain things which all must do in all climes. There are certain things which all must do in certain climes. The spinning wheel is the thing which all must turn in the Indian clime for the transition stage at any rate and the vast majority must for all time.

It was our love of foreign cloth that ousted the wheel from its position of dignity. Therefore I consider it a sin to wear foreign cloth. I must confess that. I do not draw a sharp or any distinction between economics and ethics. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and therefore sinful. Thus the economics that permit one country to prey upon another are immoral. It is sinful to buy and use articles made by sweated labour. It is sinful to eat American wheat and let my neighbour the grain dealer, starve for want of custom. Similarly it is sinful for me to wear the latest finery of Regent Street, when I know that if I had but worn the things woven by the neighbouring spinners and weavers, that would have clothed me, and fed and clothed them. On the knowledge of my sin bursting upon me, I must consign the foreign garments to the flames and thus purify myself, and thenceforth rest content with the rough *Khadi* made by my neighbours. On knowing that my neighbours may not, having given up the occupation, take kindly to the spinning wheel, I must take it up myself and thus make it popular.

I venture to suggest to the Poet, that the clothes I ask him to burn must be and are his. If they had to his knowledge belonged to the poor or the ill-clad, he would long ago have restored to the poor what was theirs. In burning *my* foreign clothes I burn my shame. I must refuse to insult the naked by giving them clothes they do not need, instead of giving them work which they sorely need. I will not commit the sin of becoming their patron, but on learning that I had assisted in impoverishing them, I would give them a

privileged position and give them neither crumbs nor cast off clothing, but the best of my food and clothes and associate myself with them in work.*

*Mr Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of December 20, 1921.

The Charkha in the Gita —In the last issue I have endeavoured to answer the objections raised by the Poet against spinning as a sacrament to be performed by all. I have done so in all humility and with the desire to convince the Poet and those who think like him. The reader will be interested in knowing, that my belief is derived largely from the Bhagavadgita, I have quoted the relevant verses in the article itself. I give below Edwin Arnold's rendering of the verses from his Song Celestial for the benefit of those who do not read Sanskrit.

Work is more excellent than idleness,

The body's life proceeds not, lacking work.

There is a task of holiness to do,

Unlike world-binding toil, which bindeth not
The faithful soul, such earthly duty do

Free from desire, and thou shalt well perform
Thy heavenly purpose, spake Prajapati

In the beginning, when all men were made,
And, with mankind, the sacrifice—"Do this !

Work ! Sacrifice ! Increase and multiply
With sacrifice ! This shall be Kamadhuk,

Your 'Cow of Plenty', giving back her milk
Of all abundance. Worship the gods thereby,

The gods shall yield ye grace. Those meats yet crave
The gods will grant to Labour, when it pays

Tithes in the altar-flame. But if one eats
Fruits of the earth, rendering to kindly heaven,

No gift of toil, that thief steals from his world,
Who eat of food after their sacrifice

Are quit of fault, but they that spread a feast
All for themselves, eat sin and drink of sin.

By food the living live, food comes of rain.
And rain comes by the pious sacrifice,

And sacrifice is paid with tithes of toil,
Thus auction is of Brahma, who is one,

The Only, All-pervading, at all times

Nor is the scheme of non-co-operation or Swadeshi an exclusive doctrine. My modesty has prevented me from declaring from the house top that the message of non-co-operation, non-violence and Swadeshi is a message to the world. It must fall flat, if it does not bear fruit in the soil where it has been delivered. At the present moment India has nothing to share with the world save her degradation, pauperism and plagues. Is it her ancient Shastras that we should send to the world? Well, they are printed in many editions, and an incredulous and idolatrous world refuses to look at them, because we the heirs and custodians do not live them. Before therefore I can think of sharing with the world, I must possess. Our non-co-operation is neither with the English nor with the West. Our non-co-operation is with the system the English have established, with the material civilisation and its attendant greed and exploitation of the weak. Our non-co-operation is a retirement within ourselves. Our non-co-opera-

Present in sacrifice. He that abstains
 To help the rolling wheels of this great world,
 Glutting his idle sense, lives a lost life,
 Shameful and vain

Work here undoubtedly refers to physical labour, and work by way of sacrifice can only be work to be done by all for the common benefit. Such work—such sacrifice can only be spinning. I do not wish to suggest, that the author of the Divine Song had the spinning wheel in mind. He merely laid down a fundamental principle of conduct. And reading in and applying it to India I can only think of spinning as the fittest and most acceptable sacrificial body labour. I cannot imagine anything nobler or more national than that for say one hour in the day we should all do the labour that the poor must do and thus identify ourselves with them and through them with all mankind. I cannot imagine better worship of God than that in his name I should labour for the poor even as they do. The spinning wheel spells a more equitable distribution of the riches of the earth.

tion is a refusal to co-operate with the English administrators on their own terms. We say to them, 'Come and co-operate with us on our terms, and it will be well for us, for you and the world.' We must refuse to be lifted off our feet. A drowning man cannot save others. In order to be fit to save others, we must try to save ourselves. Indian nationalism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving, religious and therefore humanitarian. India must learn to live before she can aspire to die for humanity. The mice which helplessly find themselves between the cat's teeth acquire no merit from their enforced sacrifice.

True to his poetical instinct the poet lives for the morrow and would have us do likewise. He presents to our admiring gaze the beautiful picture of the birds early in the morning singing hymns of praise as they soar into the sky. These birds had their day's food and soared with rested wings in whose veins new blood had flown during the previous night. But I have had the pain of watching birds who for want of strength could not be coaxed even into a flutter of their wings. The human bird under the Indian sky gets up weaker than when he pretended to retire. For millions it is an eternal vigil or an eternal trance. It is an indescribably painful state which has to be experienced to be realised. I have found it impossible to soothe suffering patients with a song from Kabir. The hungry millions ask for one poem-invigorating food. They cannot be given it. They must earn it. And they can earn only by the sweat of their brow. (Here follows some versus from the Gita translation which is given in the footnote in page 1047.)

THE FEAR OF DEATH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 13, 1921.)

I have been collecting descriptions of Swaraj. One of these would be; Swaraj is the abandonment of the fear of death. A nation which allows itself to be influenced by the fear of death cannot attain Swaraj, and cannot retain it if somehow attained.

English people carry their lives in their pockets. Arabs and Pathans consider death as nothing more than ordinary ailment; they never weep when a relation dies. Boer women are perfectly innocent of this fear. In the Boer war, thousands of young Boer women became widowed. They never cared. It did not matter in the least if the husband or the son was lost; it was enough and more than enough that the country's honour was safe. What booted the husband if the country was enslaved? It was infinitely better to bury a son's mortal remains and to cherish his immortal memory than to bring him up as a serf. Thus did the Boer women steel their hearts and cheerfully give up their darlings to the Angel of Death.

The people I have mentioned kill and get killed. But what of those who do not kill but are only ready to die themselves? Such people become the objects of a world's adoration. They are the salt of the earth.

The English and the Germans fought one another; they killed and got killed. The result is that animosities have increased. There is no end of unrest, and the

present condition of Europe is pitiful. There is more of deceit, and each is anxious to circumvent the rest.

But the fearlessness which we are cultivating is of a nobler and purer order and it is therefore that we hope to achieve a signal victory within a very short time.

When we attain Swaraj, many of us will have given up the fear of death ; or else we shall not have attained Swaraj. Till now mostly young boys have died in the cause. Those who died in Aligadh were all below twenty-one. No one knew who they were. If Government resort to firing now, I am hoping that some men of the first rank will have the opportunity of offering up the supreme sacrifice.

Why should we be upset when children or young men or old men die ? Not a moment passes when some one is not born or is not dead in this world. We should feel the stupidity of rejoicing in a birth and lamenting a death. Those who believe in the soul—and what Hindu, Mussalman or Parsi is there who does not ?—know that the soul never dies. The souls of the living as well as of the dead are all one. The eternal processes of creation and destruction are going on ceaselessly. There is nothing in it for which we might give ourselves up to joy or sorrow, Even if we extend the idea of relationship only to our countrymen and take all the births in the country as taking place in our own family, how many births shall we celebrate ? If we weep for all the death in our country, the tears in our eyes would never dry. This train of thought should help us to get rid of all fear of death.

India, they say, is a nation of philosophers ; and we have not been unwilling to appropriate the compliment.

Still, hardly any other nation becomes so helpless in the face of death as we do. And in India again, no other community perhaps betrays so much of this helplessness as the Hindus. A single birth is enough for us to be beside ourselves with ludicrous joyfulness. A death makes us indulge in orgies of loud lamentation which condemn the neighbourhood to sleeplessness for the night. If we wish to attain Swaraj, and if having attained it we wish to make it something to be proud of, we must perfectly renounce this unseemly fright.

And what is imprisonment to the man who is fearless of death itself? If the reader will bestow a little thought upon the matter, he will find that if Swaraj is delayed, it is delayed because we are not prepared calmly to meet death and inconveniences less than death.

As larger and larger numbers of innocent men come out to welcome death, their sacrifice will become the potent instrument for the salvation of all others; and there will be a minimum of suffering. Suffering cheerfully endured ceases to be suffering and is transmuted into an ineffable joy. The man who flies from suffering is the victim of endless tribulation before it has come to him, and is half dead when it does come. But one who is cheerfully ready for anything and everything that comes, escapes all pain; his cheerfulness acts as an anaesthetic.

I have been led to write about this subject because we have got to envisage even death if we will have Swaraj this very year. One who is previously prepared often escapes accidents; and this may be the case with us. It is my firm conviction that Swadeshi constitutes this preparation. When once Swadeshi is a success, neither

this Government nor any one else will feel the necessity of putting us to any further test.

Still it is best not to neglect any contingency whatever. Possession of power makes me blind and deaf; they cannot see things which are under their very nose, and cannot hear things which invade their ears. There is thus no knowing what this power-intoxicated Government may not do. So it seemed to me that patriotic men ought to be prepared for death, imprisonment and similar eventualities.

The brave meet death with a smile on their lips, but they are circumspect all the same. There is no room for foolhardiness in this non-violent war. We do not propose to go to gaol or to die by an immoral act. We must mount the gallows while resisting the oppressive laws of this Government.—(Translated from the Gujarati *Navajivan* by D.)

THE MEANING OF THE MOPLAH RISING

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 20, 1921.)

A correspondent from Scotland takes me to task for not dealing sufficiently with the Moplah rising in these columns. The result, he says, has been that those in Great Britain who are in the habit of studying Indian affairs have been induced to believe that an Islamic kingdom is established in India. The reproof is not wholly undeserved, but I have not shirked duty in the matter. I have been simply helpless. I wanted to go to

Calicut and reach the bottom of the trouble as I believed I could have. But the Government had willed it otherwise. I am sorry to believe but it is my belief, that the men on the spot do not want to end the trouble. They certainly do not wish to give non-co-operators the credit for peacefully ending the trouble. They are desirous of showing once more that it is only the British soldier who can maintain peace in India. And I could not then give battle to the Government by disregarding the instructions not to enter the disturbed area.

I should like to think better of the men on the spot. It is contrary to my nature to believe in the depravity of human beings. But there is so much evidence about me of the depravity of the bureaucratic mind that it will stop at nothing to gain its end. It is the literal truth I tell, when I say that before I went to Champara, I did not believe the stories I was told of atrocities committed against the peasantry of Champaran. When I went there, I found the state much worse than was described to me. I had refused to believe that innocent people could have been murdered in cold blood without warning as they were in Jallianwala Bagh. I had refused to believe that human beings could be made to crawl upon their bellies. But on reaching the Punjab, I found to my horror that much more than what I was told had happened. And all this was done in the name of peace and order so called, but in reality for the purpose of sustaining a false prestige, a false system and an unnatural commerce. It is true that a strong Lieutenant-Governor was able to attain justice in Champaran in the face of overwhelming opposition. But that was really an exception due to exceptional causes. And

so I feel the Moplah revolt has come as a blessing to a system that is crumbling to pieces by the weight of its own enormity.

The Moplah revolt is a test for Hindus and Mussalmans. Can Hindu friendship survive the strain put upon it? Can Mussalmans in the deepest recesses of their hearts approve of the conduct of the Moplahs? Time alone can show the reality. A verbal and forced philosophic acceptance of the inevitable is no test of Hindu friendship. The Hindus must have the courage and the faith to feel that they can protect their religion in spite of such fanatical eruptions. A verbal disapproval by the Mussalmans of Moplah madness is no test of Mussalman friendship. The Mussalmans must naturally feel the shame and humiliation of the Moplah conduct about forcible conversions and looting, and they must work away so silently and effectively that such things might become impossible even on the part of the most fanatical among them. My belief is that the Hindus as a body have received the Moplah madness with equanimity and that the cultured Mussalmans are sincerely sorry for the Moplah's perversion of the teachings of the Prophet.

The Moplah revolt teaches another lesson, *viz.*, that each individual must be taught the art of self-defence. It is more a mental state that has to be inculcated than that our bodies should be trained for retaliation. Our mental training has been one of feeling helpless. Bravery is not a quality of the body, it is of the soul. I have seen cowards encased in tough muscle, and rare courage in the frailest body. I have seen big bulky and muscular Zulus cowering before an English lad and turning tail if they saw a

loaded revolver pointed at them. I have seen Emily Hobhouse with a paralytic body exhibiting courage of the highest order. She was the one noble woman who kept up the drooping spirits of brave Boer generals and equally brave Boer women. The weakest of us physically must be taught the art of facing dangers and giving a good account of ourselves. What was more detestable, the ignorant fanaticism of the Moplah brother, or the cowardliness of the Hindu brother who helplessly muttered the Islamic formula or allowed his tuft of hair to be cut or his vest to be changed ? Let me not be misunderstood. I want both the Hindus and Mussalmans to cultivate the cool courage to die without killing. But if one has not that courage, I want him to cultivate the art of killing and being killed, rather than in a cowardly manner flee from danger. For the latter in spite of his flight does commit mental *himsa*. He flees because he has not the courage to be killed in the act of killing.

There is yet another lesson the Moplah outbreak teaches us. We dare not leave any section of our countrymen in utter darkness and expect not to be overtaken by it ourselves. Our English 'masters' were uninterested in the Moplahs becoming orderly citizens and learning the virtue of toleration and the truth of Islam. But we too have neglected our ignorant countrymen all these long centuries. We have not felt the call of love to see that no one was left ignorant of the necessity of humaneness or remained in want of food or clothing for no fault of his own. If we do not wake up betimes, we shall find a similar tragedy enacted by all the submerged classes. The

present awakening is affecting all classes. The "untouchables" and all the so-called semi-savage tribes will presently bear witness to our wrongs against them if we do not do penance and render tardy justice to them.

HINDUS AND MOPLAHS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 26, 1922.)

Though the letters on the Moplah trouble and the Musalman attitude by Messrs. Keshav Menon and others have already appeared in the press, contrary to my wont I publish the two communications for the importance that attaches to them. * Possibly the fact of their publication in the pages of *Young India* will be some balm for the wounds that the Moplah madness as inflicted in the Hindu heart. The writers were entitled to give vent to their pent up feelings

Maulana Hasrat Mohani is one of our most courageous men. He is strong and unbending. He is frank to a fault. In his insensate hatred of the English Government and possibly even of Englishmen in general he has seen nothing wrong in anything that the Moplahs have done. Everything is fair in love and war with the Maulana. He has made up his mind that the Moplahs have fought for their religion. And that fact (in his estimation) practically absolves the Moplah from all blame. That is no doubt a travesty of religion and morality. But to do irreligion for the sake of religion is the religious creed of

* Not included in this collection.

Maulana Hasrat Mohana. I know it has no warrant in Islam. I have talked to several learned Mussalmans. They do not defend Hasrat Mohani's attitude.

I advise my Malabar friends not to mind the Maulana. In spite of his amazingly crude views about religion, there is no greater nationalist nor a greater lover of Hindu-Muslim unity than the Maulana. His heart is sound and superior to his intellect, which, in my humble opinion, has suffered aberration.

The Malabar friends are wrong in thinking that the Mussalmans in general have not condemned or have in my way approved of the various crimes committed by the Moplahs. Islam protects even in war women, children and old men from molestation. Islam does not justify *Jehad* except under well-defined conditions. So far as I know the law of Islam, the Moplahs could not, on their own initiative, declare *Jehad*. Maulana Abdul Bari has certainly condemned the Moplah excesses.

But what though the Mussalmans did not condemn them? Hindu-Muslim friendship is not a bargain. The very word friendship excludes any such idea. If we have acquired the national habit, the Moplah is every whit a countryman as a Hindu. Hindus may not attach greater weight to Moplah fanaticism than to Hindu fanaticism. If instead of the Moplahs, Hindus had violated Hindu homes in Malabar, against whom would the complaint be lodged? Hindus have to find out a remedy against such occurrence as much as the Mussalmans. When a Hindu or a Mussalman does evil, it is evil, it is evil done by an Indian to an Indian, and each one of us must personally share the blame and try to remove the evil. There is no

other meaning to unity than this. Nationalism is nothing, if it is not at least this. Nationalism is greater than sectarianism. And in that sense we are Indians first and Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis, Christians after.

Whilst, therefore, we may regret Maulana Hasrat Mohani's attitude on the Moplah question, we must not blame the Mussalmans as a whole, nor must we blame the Maulana as a Mussalman. We should deplore the fact that one Indian does not see the obvious wrong that our other brethren have done. There is no unity, if we must continuously look at things communally.

Critics may say, 'All this is sheer nonsense, because it is so inconsistent with facts. It is visionary'. But my contention is that we shall never achieve solidarity unless new facts are made to suit the principle, instead of performing the impossible feat of changing the principle to suit existing facts. I see nothing impossible in Hindus as Indians, trying to wean the Moplahs, as Indians, from their error. I see nothing impossible in asking the Hindus to develop courage and strength to die before accepting forced conversion. I was delighted to be told that there were Hindus who did prefer the Moplah hatchet to forced conversion. If these have died without anger or malice they have died as truest Hindus because they were truest among Indians and men. And thus would these men have died even if their persecutors had been Hindus instead of Mussalmans. Hindu-Muslim unity will be a very cheap and tawdry affair, if it has to depend upon mere reciprocation. Is a husband's loyalty dependent upon the wife's, or may a wife be faithless because the husband is a rake?

Marriage will be a sordid thing when the partners treat their conduct as a matter of exchange, pure and simple. Unity is like marriage. It is more necessary for a husband to draw closer to his wife when she is about to fall. Then is the time for a double outpouring of love. Even so is it more necessary for a Hindu to love the Maplah and the Mussalman more, when the latter is likely to injure him or has already injured him. Unity to be real must stand the severest strain without breaking. It must be an indissoluble tie.

And I hold that what I have put before the country in the foregoing lines is a simple selfish idea. Does a Hindu love his religion and country more than himself? *If* he does, it follows that he must not quarrel with an ignorant Mussalman, who neither knows country nor religion. The process is like that of the world-famed woman who professed to give up her child to her rival instead of dividing it with the latter, a performance that would have suited the latter admirably.

Let us assume (which is not the fact) that the Mussalmans really approve of all that the Moplahs have done. Is the compact, then, to be dissolved? And when it is dissolved, will the Hindus be any better off for the dissolution? Will they revenge themselves upon the Moplahs by getting foreign assistance to destroy them and their fellow Mussalmans, and be content to be for ever slaves?

Non-co-operation is a universal doctrine because it is as applicable to family relations as to any other. It is a process of evolving strength and self-reliance. Both the Hindus and Mussalmans must learn to stand alone against the whole world, before they become really

united. This unity is not to be between weak parties, but between men who are conscious of their strength. It will be an evil day for Mussalmans if, where³ they are in a minority, they have to depend for the observance of their religion upon Hindu good will and *vice versa*. Non-co operation is a process of self-realisation.

But this self-realisation is impossible, if the strong become brutes and tread upon the weak. Then, they must be trodden under by the stronger. Hence, if Hindus and Mussalmans really wish to live as men of religion, they must develop strength from within. They must be both strong and humble. Hindus must find out the causes of Moplah fanaticism. They will find that they are not without blame. They have hitherto not cared for the Moplah. They have either treated him as a serf or dreaded him. They have not treated him as a friend and neighbour, to be reformed and respected. It is no use now becoming angry with the Moplahs or the Mussalmans in general. Whilst Hindus have a right to expect Mussalman aid and sympathy, the problem is essentially one of self-help, *i.e.*, development of strength from within. It would be a sad day for Islam if the defence of the Khilafat was to depend upon Hindu help. Hindu help is at the disposal of the Mussalmans, because it is the duty of the Hindus, as neighbours, to give it. And whilst Mussalmans accept help so ungrudgingly given, their final reliance is and must be upon God. He is the never failing and sole Help of the helpless. And so let it be with the Hindus of Malabar.

A TAXING EXAMINER.

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 6, 1921.)

I would love to feel that I was an M. A. of the University of non-co-operation. But my examiners show me that, whilst I have matriculated in that University, I have yet to fill many a term in the college course. Of all my many correspondents, the Sindhi friends are the most searching, and even provoking. What I present to the readers of *Young India* is but a sample of examination papers set to me. Here is one such from Sindh :

(1) Do you expect that violence will ensue from your movement of non-co-operation ?

If I did, I would not have advised it.

(2) Explain fully the doctrine of non-violence.

Non-violence is not doing, voluntarily, any injury to person or property. Thus, I would not punish or procure punishment even of General Dyer for his massacre, but I would not call it voluntarily doing injury to him to refuse to give him pension, or to condemn his action in fitting language. It is no part of my duty to protect a murderer even though he may be my son or father. I hold it to be my duty to withdraw my support from him. I will not kill a snake neither may I harbour it.

(3) If violence ensues from your movement, will you retire to the mountains ?

If violence results *from* non-co-operation, or if non-cooperators resort to violence *i. e.*, if India makes vio-

lence her creed, and I have survived, I would not care to live in India. She will cease to evoke any pride in me. My patriotism is subservient to my religion. I cling to India like a child to its mother's breast, because I feel that she gives me the spiritual nourishment I need. She has the environment that responds to my highest aspiration. When that faith is gone, I shall feel like an orphan without hope of ever finding a guardian. Then the snowy solitude of the Himalayas as must give what rest it can to my bleeding soul. Needless to say, the violence that would drive me to the Himalayas is not this violence of language or rowdyism which my critics often fling in my face whilst reminding me of Himalayas. It is violence not due to non-co-operation, nor is it violence of the real non-co-operators. These outbursts are a legacy of our undisciplined past. It is being brought under check day by day. It is so insignificant as to be itself a mighty demonstration of the peace that reigns supreme in India to-day. This peace, in the face of provocation attempted by officials knowingly or unknowingly, in the shape of their vexatious and often illegal notices, must, if continued, in itself ensure Swaraj within the year. For it shows unity of purpose and determination among the people.

- (4) What should other non-co-operators do, if such violence breaks out? Should they stop the preaching of non-co-operation?

When (if ever) that tempestuous violence breaks out, true non-co-operators would have died in the attempt to prevent violence. Question 4 presupposes my sole survivorship. But assume that I have scuttled to the

Himalayas, (as it would then be to escape death), the remaining non-co-operators would certainly be expected to remain true to their faith in spite of my cowardly retreat and be living witnesses to their faith till the flames overwhelm them. The voice of the preacher will then be drowned in the onrushing torrent of blood.

- (5) If you retire to the mountains, what will be the fate of the poor students who have boycotted aided or Government institutions ?

The questioner forgets that, when violence reigns supreme in India, there will be no school, aided or unaided, for students to attend. Only those students are called upon to leave Government schools who consider it to be sinful to remain in them. The question of returning to such schools does not arise in their case. And what has my retirement to the mountains to do with the students' withdrawal ? Every student is expected to judge for himself what is best for him and his country. The movement of self-government cannot, must not be made to depend upon one man. I have but presented India with a new and matchless weapon, or rather an extended application of an ancient and tried weapon. She must reject or accept it for her own use. I cannot use it for her. I can use, have used it, for myself and feel free. Others have done, and feel likewise. If the nation uses the weapon, she becomes free.

- (6) How far has your movement of non-co-operation progressed ?

So far that I feel Swaraj running to us. If we keep up the same velocity, we shall be a free nation within this year.

- (7) Are you aware that most of the non-co-operating workers are irresponsible ? Have you ever condemned them ?

I am not ; on the contrary, I am aware that most of them are responsible, sober, honest, and brave workers. I hope I have condemned irresponsibility wherever I have found it.

- (8) Under what circumstances do you expect to get Swaraj in October ?

I have often mentioned the conditions in these columns. The correspondent must look up the back numbers.

- (9) Will the spinning wheel solve the problem of India's poverty ? If it will, how ?

I am more than ever convinced that, without the spinning wheel, the problem of India's poverty cannot be solved. Millions of India's peasants starve for want of supplementary occupation. If they have spinning to add to their slender resources, they can fight successfully against pauperism and famine. Mills cannot solve the problem. Only hand-spinning—and nothing else—can. When India was forced to give up hand-spinning, she had no other occupation in return. Imagine what would happen to a man who found himself suddenly deprived of a quarter of his bare livelihood. Over eighty-five per cent. of her population have more than a quarter of their time lying idle. And, therefore even apart from the terrible drain rightly pointed out by the G. O. M. of India, she has steadily grown poorer because of this enforced idleness. The problem is now to utilise these billions of hours of the nation without disturbing the rest. Restoration of the spinning wheel is the only possible answer. This has

nothing to do with my special views on machinery or with the boycott of foreign goods in general. India is likely to accept the answer in full during this year. It is madness to tinker with the problem. I am writing this in Puri in front of the murmuring waves. The picture of the crowd of men, women, and children with their fleshless ribs under the very shadow of Jagannath, haunts me. If I had the power, I would suspend every other activity in schools, and colleges, and everywhere else, and popularise spinning; prepare out of these lads and lasses spinning teachers; inspire every carpenter to prepare spinning wheels; and ask the teachers to take these life-giving machines to every home, and teach them spinning. If I had the power, I would stop an ounce of cotton from being exported and would have it turned into yarn in these homes. I would dot India with depots for receiving this yarn and distributing it among weavers. Given sufficient steady and trained workers, I would undertake to drive pauperism out of India during this year. This undoubtedly requires a change in the angle of vision and in the national taste. I regard the Reforms and everything else in the nature of opiates to deaden our conscience. We must refuse to wait for generations to furnish us with a patient solution of a problem which is ever-growing in seriousness. Nature knows no mercy in dealing stern justice. If we do not wake up before long, we shall be wiped out of existence. I invite the sceptics to visit Orissa, penetrate its villages, and find out for themselves where India stands. They will then believe with me that to possess, or to wear, an ounce of foreign cloth is a

crime against India and humanity. I am able to restrain myself from committing suicide by starvation, only because I have faith in India's awakening, and her ability to put herself on the way to freedom from this desolating pauperism. Without faith in such a possibility, I should cease to take interest in living. I invite the questioner, and every other intelligent lover of his country, to take part in this privileged national service in making spinning universal by introducing it in every home and make it profitable for the nation by helping to bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth during this year. I have finished the questions and endeavoured to answer them. The most important from the practical stand-point was the one regarding spinning. I hope I have demonstrated the necessity of home-spinning as the only means of dealing with India's poverty. I know, however, that innumerable difficulties face a worker in putting the doctrine into execution. The most difficult, perhaps, is that of getting a proper wheel. Save in the Punjab where the art is still alive, the difficulty is very real. The carpenters have forgotten the construction and the innocent workers are at their wit's end. The chief thing undoubtedly, therefore, is for the worker to make himself acquainted with the art and the handling of spinning wheels. I lay down some simple tests for them. No machine that fails to satisfy the tests should be accepted or distributed.

- (1) The wheel must turn easily, freely and noiselessly.
- (2) The turning handle must be rigidly fixed to the axle.
- (3) The posts must be properly driven home and joints well fixed.

(4) The spindle must turn noiselessly and without a throb in its holders. Jarring sound cannot be avoided unless the bolders are made of knit straw as in the Punjab, or of tough leather.

(5) No machine is properly made unless it manufactures in the hands of a practised spinner at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ tolas of even and properly twisted yarn of six counts in an hour. I know a youngster, who has not had more than perhaps three months' practice, having been able to spin $2\frac{1}{2}$ tolas of the above quality of yarn in 35 minutes. No machine should be given out until it has been worked for at least full one hour in the manner suggested and found satisfactory.

NEITHER A SAINT NOR A POLITICIAN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 12, 1920.)

A kind friend has sent me the following cutting from the April number of the *East and West*.

Mr. Gandhi has the reputation of a saint but it seems that the politician in him often dominates his decisions. He has been making great use of *hartals* and there can be no gainsaying that under his direction *hartal* is becoming a powerful political weapon for uniting the educated and the uneducated on a single question of the day. The *hartal* is not without its disadvantages. It is teaching direct action, and direct action however potent does not work for unity. Is Mr. Gandhi quite sure that he is serving the highest behests of 'ahimsa', harmlessness? His proposal to commemorate the shooting at Jallianwalla Bagh is not likely to promote concord. It is a tragic incident into which our Government was betrayed, but is the memory of its bitterness worth retaining? Can we not commemorate the event by raising a temple of peace, to hold the widows and orphans, to bless the souls of those who died without knowing why? The world is full of politicians and pettifoggers who in the name of patriotism poison the inner sweetness of man and, as a result, we have wars and feuds and such shameless slaughter as turned Jallianwalla Bagh into a shambles. Shall we not now try for a larger symbiosis such as Buddha and Christ preached, and bring the world to breathe and prosper together?

Mr Gandhi seemed destined to be the apostle of such a movement, but circumstances are forcing him to seek the way of raising resistances and group unities. He may yet take up the larger mission of uniting the world.

I have given the whole of the quotation. As a rule I do not notice criticism of me or my methods except when thereby I acknowledge a mistake or enforce still further the principles criticised. I have a double reason for noticing the extract. For, not only do I hope further to elucidate the principles I hold dear, but I want to show my regard for the author of the criticism whom I know and whom I have admired for many years for the singular beauty of his character. The critic regrets to see in me a politician, whereas he expected me to be a saint. Now I think that the word "saint" should be ruled out of present life. It is too sacred a word to be lightly applied to anybody, much less to one like myself who claims only to be a humble searcher after truth, knows his limitations, makes mistakes, never hesitates to admit them when he makes them, and frankly confesses that he, like a scientist, is making experiments about some 'of the eternal varieties' of life, but cannot even claim to be a scientist because he can show no tangible proof of scientific accuracy in his methods or such tangible results of his experiments as modern science demands. But though by disclaiming sainthood I disappoint the critic's expectations, I would have him to give up his regrets by answering him that the politician in me has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I seem to take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us to day like the coil of a snake from which one cannot get out, no matter how much one tries. I wish therefore to wrestle with the snake, as I have been doing with more or less success consciously since 1894, unconsciously, as I have now discovered, ever since reaching years of discretion. Quite selfishly, as I wish to live in peace in the midst of a bellowing storm howling round me, I have been ex-

perimenting with myself and my friends by introducing religion into politics. Let me explain what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself, known its Maker and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself.

It was in that religious spirit that I came upon *hartal*. I wanted to show that it is not a knowledge of letters that would give India consciousness of herself, or that would bind the educated together. The *hartal* illuminated the whole of India as if by magic on the 6th of April 1919. And had it not been for the interruption of the 10th of April brought about by Satan whispering fear into the ears of a government conscious of its own wrong and inciting to anger a people that were prepared for it by utter distrust of the Government, India would have risen to an unimaginable height. The *hartal* had not only been taken up by the great masses of people in a truly religious spirit but it was intended to be a prelude to a series of direct actions

But my critic deplores direct action. For, he says, "it does not work for unity." I join issue with him. Never has anything been done on this earth, without direct action. I rejected the word "passive resistance," because of its insufficiency and its being interpreted as a weapon of the weak. It was direct action in South Africa which told and told so effectively that it converted General Smuts to sanity. He was in 1906 the most relentless opponent of Indian aspirations. In 1914 he took pride in doing tardy justice by removing

rom the Statute Book of the Union a disgraceful measure which, in 1909, he had told Lord Morley, would be never removed, for he then said South Africa would never tolerate repeal of a measure which was twice passed by the Transvaal Legislature. But what is more, direct action sustained for eight years left behind it not only no bitterness, but the very Indians who put up such a stubborn fight against General Smuts, ranged themselves round his banner in 1915 and fought under him in East Africa. It was direct action in Champaran which removed an age-long grievance. A meek submission when one is chafing under a disability or a grievance which one would gladly see removed, not only does not make for unity, but makes the weak party acid, angry and prepared him for an opportunity to explode. By allying myself with the weak party, by teaching him direct, firm but harmless action, I make him feel strong and capable of defying the physical might. He feels braced for the struggle, regains confidence in himself and knowing that the remedy lies with himself, ceases to harbour the spirit of revenge and learns to be satisfied with a redress of the wrong he is seeking to remedy.

It is working along the same line that I have ventured to suggest a memorial about Jallianwalla Bagh. The writer in *East and West* has ascribed to men a proposal which has never once crossed my mind. He thinks that I want "to commemorate the shooting at Jallianwalla Bagh". Nothing can be further from my thought than to perpetuate the memory of a black deed. I dare say that before we have come to our own we shall have a repetition of the tragedy and I will prepare the nation for it by treasuring the memory of the innocent dead. The widows and the orphans have been and are being helped, but we cannot "bless the souls of those who died without knowing why", if we will not acquire the ground which has been hallowed by

innocent blood and there erect a suitable memorial for them. It is not to serve, if I help it, as a reminder of foul deed but it shall serve as an encouragement to the nation that it is better to die helpless and unarmed and as victims rather than as tyrants. I would have the future generations remember that we who witnessed the innocent dying did not ungratefully refuse to cherish their memory. As Mrs. Jinnah truly remarked when she gave her mite to the fund, the memorial would at least give us an excuse for living. After all it will be the spirit in which the memorial is erected that will decide its character.

What was the larger 'symbiosis' that Buddha and Christ preached? Buddha fearlessly carried the war into the enemy's camp and brought down on its knees an arrogant priesthood. Christ drove out the money-changers from the temple of Jerusalem and drew down curses from Heaven upon the hypocrites and the pharisees. Both were for intensely direct action. But even as Buddha and Christ chastised they showed unmistakable gentleness and love behind every act of theirs. They would not raise a finger against their enemies, but would gladly surrender themselves rather than the truth for which they lived. Buddha would have died resisting the priesthood, if the majesty of his love had not proved to be equal to the task of bending the priesthood. Christ died on the cross with a crown of thorns on his head defying the might of a whole empire. And if I raise resistances of a non-violent character I simply and humbly follow in the foot steps of the great teachers named by my critic. . . .

HINDUISM

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 6, 1921.)

In dealing with the problem of untouchability during the Madras tour, I have asserted my claim to being a Sanatani Hindu with greater emphasis than hitherto, and yet there are things which are commonly done in the name of Hinduism, which I disregard. I have no desire to be called a Sanatani Hindu or any other if I am not such. And I have certainly no desire to steal in a reform or an abuse of under cover of a great faith.

It is therefore necessary for me once for all distinctly to give my meaning of Sanatan Hinduism. The word Sanatana I use in its natural sense.

I call myself a Sanatani Hindu, because,

(1) I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures, and therefore in *avatars* and rebirth,

(2) I believe in the *Varnashrama Dharma* in a sense in my opinion strictly Vedic but not in its present popular and crude sense,

(3) I believe in the protection of the cow in its much larger sense than the popular,

(4) I do not disbelieve in idol-worship.

The reader will note that I have purposely refrained from using the word divine origin in reference to the Vedas or any other scriptures. For I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas. I believe the Bible, the Koran, and the Zend Avesta to be as

much divinely inspired as the Vedas. My belief in the Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first-hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But I do claim to know and feel the truths of the essential teaching of the scriptures. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense. I do most emphatically repudiate the claim (if they advance any such) of the present Shankaracharyas and Shastris to give a correct interpretation of the Hindu scriptures. On the contrary I believe, that our present knowledge of these books is in a most chaotic state. I believe implicitly in the Hindu aphorism, that no one truly knows the Shastras who has not attained perfection in Innocence (*Ahimsa*), Truth (*Satya*) and Self-control (*Brahmacharya*) and who has not renounced all acquisition or possession of wealth. I believe in the institution of Gurus, but in this age millions must go without a Guru, because it is a rare thing to find a combination of perfect purity and perfect learning. But one need not despair of ever knowing the truth of one's religion, because the fundamentals of Hinduism as of every great religion are unchangeable, and easily understood. Every Hindu believes in God and His oneness; in rebirth and salvation. But that which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its cow protection, more than its *Varnashrama*.

Varnashrama is, in my opinion, inherent in human nature, and Hinduism has simply reduced it to a science. It does attach to birth. A man cannot change his *varna* by choice. Not to abide by one's *varna* is to disregard

the law of heredity. The division, however, into innumerable castes is an unwarranted liberty taken with the doctrine. The four divisions are all-sufficing.

I do not believe that interdining or even intermarriage necessarily deprives a man of his status that his birth has given him. The four divisions define a man's calling, they do not restrict or regulate social intercourse. The divisions define duties, they confer no privileges. It is, I hold, against the genius of Hinduism to arrogate to oneself a higher status or assign to another a lower. All are born to serve God's creation, a Brahman with his knowledge, a Kshatriya with his power of protection, a Vaishya with his commercial ability and a Shudra with bodily labour. This however does not mean that a Brahman for instance is absolved from bodily labour, or the duty of protecting himself and others. His birth makes a Brahman predominantly a man of knowledge, the fittest by heredity and training to impart it to others. There is nothing, again, to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wishes. Only, he will best serve with his body and need not envy others their special qualities for service. But a Brahman who claims superiority by right of knowledge falls and has no knowledge. And so with the others who pride themselves upon their special qualities. *Varnashrama* is self-restraint and conservation and economy of energy.

Though therefore *Varnashrama* is not affected by interdining or inter-marriage, Hinduism does most emphatically discourage inter-dining and inter-marriage between divisions. Hinduism reached the highest limit of self-restraint. It is undoubtedly a religion of renunciation of

the flesh so that the spirit may be set free. It is no part of a Hindu's duty to dine with his son. And by restricting his choice of a bride to a particular group, he exercises rare self-restraint. Hinduism does not regard a married state as by any means essential for salvation. Marriage is a 'fall' even as birth is a fall. Salvation is freedom from birth and hence death also. Prohibition against inter-marriage and inter-dining is essential for a rapid evolution of the soul. But this self-denial is no test of *Varna*. A Brahman may remain a Brahman, though he may dine with his Shudra brother, if he has not left off his duty of service by knowledge. It follows from what I have said above, that restraint in matters of marriage and dining is not based upon notions of superiority. A Hindu who refuses to dine with another from a sense of superiority misrepresents his *Dharma*.

Unfortunately to-day Hinduism seems to consist merely in eating and not eating. Once I horrified a pious Hindu by taking toast at a Mussalman's house. I saw that he was pained to see me pouring milk into a cup handed by a Mussalman friend, but his anguish knew no bounds when he saw me taking toast at the Mussalman's hands. Hinduism is in danger of losing its substance if it resolves itself into a matter of elaborate rules as to what and with whom to eat. Abstemiousness from intoxicating drinks and drugs, and from all kinds of foods, especially meat, is undoubtedly a great aid to the evolution of the spirit, but it is by no means an end in itself. Many a man eating meat and with everybody, but living in the fear of God is nearer his freedom than a man religiously

abstaining from meat and many other things but blaspheming God in every one of his acts.

The central fact of Hinduism however is cow protection. Cow protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem of pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless. Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow.

The way to protect is to die for. It is a denial of Hinduism and *Ahimsa* to kill a human being to protect a cow. Hindus are enjoined to protect the cow by their *tapasya*, by self-purification, by self-sacrifice. The present day cow protection has degenerated into a perpetual feud with the Mussalmans, whereas cow protection means conquering the Mussalmans by our love. A Mussalman friend sent me sometime ago a book detailing the inhumanities practised by us on the cow and her progeny. How we bleed her to take the last drop of milk from her, how we starve her to emaciation,

how we ill-treat the calves, how we deprive them of their portion of milk, how cruelly we treat the oxen, how we castrate them, how we beat them, how we overload them. If they had speech, they would bear witness to our crimes against them which would stagger the world. By every act of cruelty to our cattle, we disown God and Hinduism. I do not know that the condition of the cattle in any other part of the world is so bad as in unhappy India. We may not blame the Englishman for this. We may not plead poverty in our defence. Criminal negligence is the only cause of the miserable condition of our cattle. Our *Punjrapoles*, though they are an answer to our instinct of mercy, are a clumsy demonstration of its execution. Instead of being model dairy farms and great profitable national institutions, they are merely depots for receiving decrepit cattle.

Hindus will be judged not by their *tilaks*, not by the correct chanting of *mantras*, not by their pilgrimages, not by their most punctilious observance of caste rules but by their ability to protect the cow. Whilst professing the religion of cow protection, we have enslaved the cow and her progeny, and have become slaves ourselves.

It will now be understood why I consider myself a Sanatani Hindu. I yield to none in my regard for the cow. I have made the Khilafat cause my own, because I see that through its preservation full protection can be secured for the cow. I do not ask my Mussalman friends to save the cow in consideration of my service. My prayer ascends daily to God Almighty, that my service of a cause I hold to be just may appear so pleasing to him,

that he may change the hearts of the Mussalmans, and fill them with pity for their Hindu neighbours and make them save the animal the latter hold dear as life itself.

I can no more describe my feeling for Hinduism than for my own wife. She moves me as no other woman in the world can. Not that she has no faults. I dare say she has many more than I see myself. But the feeling of an indissoluble bond is there. Even so I feel for and about Hinduism with all its faults and limitations. Nothing elates me so much as the music of the Gita or the Ramayana by Tulasidas, the only two books in Hinduism I may be said to know. When I fancied I was taking my last breath, the Gita was my solace. I know the vice that is going on to-day in all the great Hindu shrines, but I love them in spite of their unspeakable failings. There is an interest which I take in them and which I take in no other. I am a reformer through and through. But my zeal never takes me to the rejection of any essential thing of Hinduism. I have said I do not disbelieve in idol worship. An idol does not excite any feeling of veneration in me. But I think that idol worship is part of human nature. We hanker after symbolism. Why should one be more composed in a church than elsewhere? Images are an aid to worship. No Hindu considers an image to be God. I do not consider idol worship a sin.

It is clear from the foregoing, that Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is room for the worship of all the prophets of the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term. It has not doubt absorbed many tribes in its fold, but this absorption has been of

an evolutionary imperceptible character. Hinduism tells every one to worship God according to his own faith or *Dharma*, and so it lives at peace with all the religions.

That being my conception of Hinduism, I have never been able to reconcile myself to untouchability. I have always regarded it as an excrescence. It is true that it has been handed down to us from generations. but so are many evil practices even to this day. I should be ashamed to think, that dedication of girls to virtual prostitution was a part of Hinduism. Yet it is practised by Hindus in many parts of India. I consider it positive irreligion to sacrifice goats to Kali and do not consider it a part of Hinduism. Hinduism is a growth of ages. The very name, Hinduism, was given to the religion of the people of Hindusthan by foreigners. There was no doubt at one time sacrifice of animals offered in the name of religion. But it is not religion, much less is it Hindu religion. And so also it seems to me, that when cow protection became an article of faith with our ancestors, those persisted in eating beef were excommunicated. The civil strife must have been fierce. Social boycott was applied not only to the recalcitrants, but their sins were visited upon their children also. The practice which had probably its origin in good intentions hardened into usage, and even verses crept in our sacred books giving the practice a permanence wholly undeserved and still less justified. Whether my theory is correct or not, untouchability is repugnant to reason and to the instinct of mercy, pity or love. A religion that establishes the worship of the cow cannot possibly countenance or warrant a cruel and inhuman

boycott of human beings. And I should be content to be torn to pieces rather than disown the suppressed classes. Hindus will certainly never deserve freedom, nor get it if they allow their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. And as I love Hinduism dearer than life itself, the taint has become for me an intolerable burden. Let us not deny God by denying to a fifth of our race the right of association on an equal footing.

POSITION OF WOMAN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 21, 1921.)

Shrimati Saraladevi of Katak writes :— “ Don't you admit that the treatment of woman is as bad a disease as untouchability itself ? The attitude of the young ' nationalists ' I have come in contact with, is beastly in ninety cases out of a hundred. How many of the non-co-operators in India do not regard women as objects of enjoyment ? Is that essential condition of success—self-purification—possible without a change of attitude towards woman ? ”

I am unable to subscribe that the treatment of woman is a ' disease as bad as untouchability.' Shrimati Saraladevi has grossly exaggerated the evil. Nor can the charge levelled against the non-co-operators of mere gratification of lust be sustained. A cause can only lose by exaggeration. At the same time, I have no difficulty about subscribing to the proposition, that in

order to fit ourselves for true Swaraj, men must cultivate much greater respect than they have for woman and her purity. Mr. Andrews has struck a much truer note than this lady, when he tells us in burning language that we dare not gloat over the shame of our fallen sisters. That any non-co-operator could have been found willing to relate with gusto that there were some of these erring sisters who reserved themselves for non-co-operators, is a degrading thought. There can be no distinction between co-operators and non-co-operators in this matter of vital importance for our moral well-being. All of us men must hang our heads in shame, so long as there is a single woman whom we dedicate to our lust. I will far rather see the race of man extinct, than that we should become less than beasts by making the noblest of God's creation the object of our lust. But this is not a problem merely for India. It is a world problem. And if I preach against the modern artificial life of sensual enjoyment, and ask men and women to go back to the simple life epitomised in the charkha, I do so because I know, that without an intelligent return to simplicity, there is no escape from our descent to a state lower than brutality. I passionately desire the utmost freedom for our women. I detest child marriages. I shudder to see a child widow, and shiver with rage when a husband just widowed with brutal indifference contracts another marriage. I deplore the criminal indifference of parents who keep their daughters utterly ignorant and illiterate and bring them up only for the purpose of marrying them off to some young men of means. Notwithstanding all this grief and

rage, I realise the difficulty of the problem. Women must have votes and an equal legal status. But the problem does not end there. It only commences at the point where women begin to affect the political deliberations of the nation.

To illustrate what I mean, let me relate the enchanting description a valued Mussalman friend gave me of a talk he had with a noted feminist in London. He was attending a meeting of feminists. A lady friend was surprised to find a Mussalman at such a meeting! She inquired how he found himself there. The friend said he had two major and two minor reasons for so doing. His father died when he was an infant. He owed all he was in life to his mother. Then he was married to a woman who was a real partner in life. And he had no sons but four daughters all minors in whom as a father he was deeply interested. Was it any wonder that he was a feminist? He went on, Mussalmans were accused of indifference to women. There never was a grosser libel uttered. The law of Islam gave equal rights to women. He thought that man for his lust had degraded woman. Instead of adoring the soul within her, he had set about adoring her body, and he had succeeded so well in his design that woman to-day did not know that she had begun to hug her bodily adornment which was almost a sign of her slavery. He added with his voice almost choked, if it was not so, how could it be that the fallen sisters delighted most in the embellishment of the body? Had we (men) not crushed the very soul out of them? No, he said regaining self-possession, he wanted not only the mechanical freedom for

women, he wanted also to break down the shackles that bound her of her own will. And so he had intended to bring up his daughters to an independent calling.

I need not pursue the ennobling conversation any further. I want my fair correspondent to ponder over the central idea of the Mussalman friend's discourse and tackle the problem. Woman must cease to consider herself the object of a man's lust. The remedy is more in her hands than man's. She must refuse to adorn herself for men including her husband, if she will be an equal partner with man. I cannot imagine Sita ever wasting a single moment on pleasing Rama by physical charms.

OUR FALLEN SISTERS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 15, 1921.)

The first occasion I had of meeting those women who earn their livelihood out of their shame was at Coconada in the Andhra province. There it was a few moments' interview with only half a dozen of them. The second occasion was at Barisal. Over one hundred of them met by appointment. They had sent a letter in advance, asking for an interview and telling me that they had become members of the Congress and subscribed to the Tilak Swaraj Fund, but could not understand my advice not to seek office in the various Congress Committees. They wound up by saying, that they wished to seek my advice as to their future welfare. The gentleman who handed me the letter did so with great hesitation, not knowing

whether I would be offended or pleased with the receipt of the letter. I put him at ease by assuring him that it was my duty to serve these sisters if I could in any way.

For me the two hours I passed with these sisters is a treasured memory. They told me that they were over 350 in the midst of a population of about 21,000 men, women and children. They represent the shame of the men of Barisal, and the sooner Barisal gets rid of it, the better for its great name. And what is true of Barisal is true, I fear, of every city. I mention Barisal, therefore, as an illustration. The credit of having thought of serving these sisters belongs to some young men of Barisal. Let me hope that Barisal will soon be able to claim the credit, too, of having eradicated the evil.

Of all the evils for which man has made himself responsible, none is so degrading, so shocking or so brutal as his abuse of the better half of humanity to me, the female sex, not the weaker sex. It is the noble of the two, for it is even to-day the embodiment of sacrifice, silent suffering, humility, faith and knowledge. A woman's intuition has often proved truer than man's arrogant assumption of superior knowledge. There is method in putting Sita before Rama and Radha before Krishna. Let us not delude ourselves into the belief that this gambling in vice has a place in our evolution because it is rampant and in some cases even state-regulated in civilized Europe. Let us not also perpetuate the vice on the strength of Indian precedent. We should cease to grow the moment we cease to discriminate between virtue and vice, and slavishly copy the past

locality frequented by soldiers (some of whom have been court-martialled as it is out of bound) Europeans and Anglo-Indians. He did not say anything about Indians but I heard the other day that they also go to these women. A word from you as to this debasing of manhood and lack of self-control would do more than anything else to counteract this evil. I will pledge myself to do all I can to help in the matter."

I wish I could share the English friend's belief that my word has the power he attributes to it. As I write this paragraph, the picture of the dear sisters who visited me at Cocanada after night-fall haunts me. They were dearer to me after I learnt of their shame. It was only by suggestion they could tell me what their life was. As the spokeswoman spoke to me, she had shame and sorrow written in her eyes. I could not bring myself to hold them guilty. I devoted my speech after this meeting to the necessity of personal purity. My heart therefore goes out to the fallen sisters of Lucknow. They are driven to a life of shame. I am satisfied that they do not go to it from choice. And the beast in man has made the detestable crime a lucrative profession. Lucknow is noted for its love of ease. But Lucknow is also the seat of a Mussalman divine. It has its full share of all that is noble in Islam. For the Hindus Lucknow is the capital of the Province where the spotless Sita and Rama roamed and reigned. It recalls the best days of Hindu purity, nobility, bravery, and steadfastness to truth. Non-co-operation is self-purification, and I urge all the non-co-operators and others to deal with this moral plague of Lucknow. I hope no custodian of Lucknow's good name will remind me that Lucknow is no worse than the other cities in India. Lucknow has come in by chance as an illustration. We are responsible throughout India for the purity and the safety of our womanhood. Why should not Lucknow lead?

PART VIII

Swaraj

SWARAJ IN ONE YEAR

BY M. K. GANDHI

(September 22, 1920)

Much laughter has been indulged in at my expense for having told the Congress audience at Calcutta* that if there was sufficient response to my programme of non-co-operation, Swaraj would be attained in one year. Some have ignored my condition and laughed because, of the impossibility of getting Swaraj anyhow within one year. Others have spelt the 'if' in capitals and suggested that if 'ifs' were permissible in argument, any absurdity could be proved to be a possibility. My proposition however is based on a mathematical calculation. And I venture to say that true Swaraj is a practical impossibility without due fulfilment of my conditions. Swaraj means a state such that we can maintain our separate existence without the presence of the English. If it is to be a partnership, it must be a partnership at will. There can be no Swaraj without our feeling and being the equals of Englishmen. To day we feel that we are dependent upon them for our internal and external security, for an armed peace between the Hindus and the

* At the Calcutta Special Congress.

Mussalmans, for our education and for the supply of daily wants, nay, even for the settlement of our religious squabbles. The Rajahs are dependent upon the British for their powers and the millionaires for their millions. The British know our helplessness and Sir Thomas Holland cracks jokes quite legitimately at the expense of non-co-operationists. To get Swaraj then is to get rid of our helplessness. The problem is no doubt stupendous even as it is for the fabled lion who having been brought up in the company of goats found it impossible to feel that he was a lion. As Tolstoy used to put it, mankind often laboured under hypnotism. Under its spell continuously we feel the feeling of helplessness. The British themselves cannot be expected to help us out of it. On the contrary, they din into our ears that we shall be fit to govern ourselves only by slow educative processes. The *Times* suggested that if we boycott the councils, we shall lose the opportunity of a training in Swaraj. I have no doubt that there are many who believe what the *Times* says. It even resorts to a falsehood. It audaciously says that Lord Milner's Mission listened to the Egyptians only when they were ready to lift the boycott of the Egyptian Council. For me the only training in Swaraj we need is the ability to defend ourselves against the whole world and to live our natural life in perfect freedom even though it may be full of defects. Good government is no substitute for self-government. The Afghans have a bad Government but it is self-Government. I envy them. The Japanese learnt the art through a sea of blood. And if we to-day

had the power to drive out the English by superior brute force, we would be counted their superiors, and in spite of our inexperience in debating at the Council table or in holding executive offices, we would be held fit to govern ourselves. For brute force is the only test the West has hitherto recognised. The Germans were defeated not because they were necessarily in the wrong, but because the allied Powers were found to possess greater brute strength. In the end, therefore, India must either learn the art of war which the British will not teach her, or she must follow her own way of discipline and self-sacrifice through non-co-operation. It is as amazing as it is humiliating that less than one hundred-thousand white men would be able to rule three hundred and fifteen million Indians. They do so somewhat undoubtedly by force but more by securing our co-operation in a thousand ways and making us more and more helpless and dependent on them as time goes forward. Let us not mistake reformed councils, more law-courts and even governorships for real freedom or power. They are but subtler methods of emasculation. The British cannot rule us by mere force. And so they resort to all means, honourable and dishonourable, in order to retain their hold on India. They want India's billions and they want India's man-power for their imperialistic greed. If we refuse to supply them with men and money, we achieve our goal, namely, Swaraj, equality, manliness.

The cup of our humiliation was filled during the closing scenes in the Viceregal council. Mr. Shastri

could not move his resolution on the Punjab. The Indian victims of Jallianwala received Rs. 1,250, the English victims of mob-frenzy received lacs. The officials who were guilty of crimes against those whose servants they were, were reprimanded. And the councillors were satisfied. If India were powerful, India would not have stood this addition of insult to her injury.

I do not blame the British. If we were weak in numbers as they are, we too would perhaps have resorted to the same methods as they are now employing. Terrorism and deception are weapons not of the strong but of the weak. The British are weak in numbers, we are weak in spite of our numbers. The result is that each is dragging the other down. It is common experience that Englishmen lose in character after residence in India and that Indians lose in courage and manliness by contact with Englishmen. This process of weakening is good neither for us two nations, nor for the world.

But if we Indians take care of ourselves, the English and the rest of the world would take care of themselves. Our contribution to the world's progress must therefore consist in setting our own house in order.

Training in arms for the present is out of the question. I go a step further and believe that India has a better mission for the world. It is within her power to show that she can achieve her destiny by pure self-sacrifice, *i.e.*, self-purification. This can be done only by non-co-operation. And non-co-operation is possible

only when those who commenced to co-operate begin the process of withdrawal. If we can but free ourselves from the threefold *Maya* of Government-controlled schools, Government law-courts and legislative councils, and truly control our own education, regulate our disputes and be indifferent to their legislation, we are ready to govern ourselves and we are only then ready to ask the Government servants, whether civil or military, to resign, and the tax-payers to suspend payment of taxes.

And is it such an impracticable proposition to expect parents to withdraw their children from schools and colleges and establish their own institutions or to ask lawyers to suspend their practice and devote their whole time and attention to national service against payment, where necessary, of their maintenance, or to ask candidates for councils not to enter councils and lend their passive or active assistance to the legislative machinery through which all control is exercised? The movement of non-co-operation is nothing but an attempt to isolate the brute force of the British from all the trappings under which it is hidden and to show that brute force by itself cannot for one single moment hold India.

But I frankly confess that, until the three conditions mentioned by me are fulfilled, there is no Swaraj. We may not go on taking our college degrees, taking thousands of rupees monthly from clients for cases which can be finished in five minutes and taking the keenest delight in wasting national time on the council floor

and still expect to gain national self-respect.

The last, though not the least, important part of the *Maya* still remains to be considered. That is Swadeshi. Had we not abandoned Swadeshi, we need not have been in the present fallen state. If we would get rid of the economic slavery, we must manufacture our own cloth and at the present moment only by hand-spinning and hand-weaving.

All this means discipline, self-denial, self-sacrifice, organising ability, confidence and courage. If we show this in one year among the classes that to-day count, and make public opinion, we certainly gain Swaraj within one year. If I am told that even we who lead have not these qualities in us, there certainly will never be Swaraj for India but then we shall have no right to blame the English for what they are doing. Our salvation and its time are solely dependent upon us.

SWARAJ IN NINE MONTHS

(December 29, 1920)

Asked by the *Times* representative as to his impressions formed as a result of his activities during the last three months, Mr. Gandhi said:—"My own impression of these three months' extensive experience is that this movement of non-co-operation has come to stay, and it is most decidedly a purifying movement, in spite of isolated instances of rowdiness, as for instance at Mrs. Besant's meeting in Poombay, at some places in Delhi

Bengal and even in Gujarat. The people are assimilating day after day the spirit of non-violence, not necessarily as a creed, but as an inevitable policy. I expect most startling results, more startling than, say, the discoveries of Sir J. C. Bose, or the acceptance by the people of non-violence. If the Government could be assured beyond any possibility of doubt that no violence would ever be offered by us, the Government would from that moment alter its character, unconsciously and involuntarily, but none the less surely on that account."

"After its character,—in what directions?" asked the *Times* representative.

"Certainly in the direction which we ask it should move—that being in the direction of Government becoming responsive to every call of the nation."

"Will you kindly explain further?" asked our representative.

"By that I mean," said Mr. Gandhi, "people will be able by asserting themselves through fixed determination and self-sacrifice to gain the redress of the Khilafat wrong, the Punjab wrong and attain the Swaraj of their choice."

"But what is your Swaraj, and where does the Government come in there—the Government which you say will alter its character unconsciously?"

SWARAJ OF MY IDEAL

"My Swaraj," said Mr. Gandhi, "is the Parliamentary government of India in the modern sense of the term for the time being, and that government would be

secured to us either through the friendly offices of the British people or without them."

"What do you mean by the phrase, 'without them!'" questioned the interviewer.

"This movement," continued Mr. Gandhi, "is an endeavour to purge the present Government of selfishness and greed which determine almost every one of their activities. Suppose that we have made it impossible by dissociation from them to feed their greed. They might not wish to remain in India, as happened in the case of Somaliland, where the moment its administration ceased to be a paying proposition, they evacuated it."

"How do you think," queried the representative, "in practice this will work out?"

"What I have sketched before you," said Mr. Gandhi, "is the final possibility. What I expect is that nothing of that kind will happen. In so far as I understand the British people I will recognise the force of the public opinion when it has become real and patent. Then, and only then, will they realise the hideous injustice which in their name the Imperial ministers and their representatives in India have perpetrated. They will therefore remedy the two wrongs in accordance with the wishes of the people, and they will also offer a constitution exactly in accordance with the wishes of the people of India, as represented by their chosen leaders."

"Supposing that the British Government wish to retire because India is not a paying concern, what do you think will then be the position of India?"

THE LION AND THE LAMB

Mr. Gandhi answered: "At that stage surely it is easy to understand that India will then have evolved either outstanding spiritual height or the ability to offer violence against violence. She will have evolved an organising ability of a high order, and will therefore be in every way able to cope with any emergency that might arise."

"In other words," observed the *Times* representative, "you expect the moment of the British evacuation, if such a contingency arises, will coincide with the moment of India's preparedness and ability and conditions favourable for India to take over the Indian administration as a going concern and work it for the benefit and advancement of the Nation?"

Mr. Gandhi answered the question with an emphatic affirmative. "My experience during the last months fills me with the hope," continued Mr. Gandhi, "that within the nine months that remain of the year in which I have expected Swaraj for India we shall redress the two wrongs and we shall see Swaraj established in accordance with the wishes of the people of India."

"Where will the present Government be at the end of the nine months?" asked the *Times* representative.

Mr. Gandhi, with a significant smile, said: "The lion will then lie with the lamb."

ON THE WRONG TRACK

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 8, 1920)

Lord Ronaldshay has been doing me the favour of reading my booklet on Indian Home Rule which is a translation of Hind Swaraj. His Lordship told his audience that if Swaraj meant what I had described it to be in the booklet, the Bengalis would have none of it. I am sorry that Swaraj of the Congress resolution does not mean the Swaraj depicted in the booklet: Swaraj according to the Congress means Swaraj that the people of India want, not what the British Government may condescend to give. In so far as I can see, Swaraj will be a Parliament chosen by the people with the fullest power over finance, the police, the military, the navy, the courts and the educational institutions.

I am free to confess that the Swaraj I expect to gain within one year, if India responds, will be such Swaraj as will make practically impossible the repetition of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, and will enable the nation to do good or evil as it chooses, and not be 'good' at the dictation of an irresponsible, insolent, and godless bureaucracy. Under that Swaraj the nation will have the power to impose a heavy protective tariff on such foreign goods as are capable of being manufactured in India, as also the power to refuse to send a single soldier outside India for the purpose of enslaving the surrounding or remote nationalities.

The Swaraj that I dream of will be a possibility only when the nation is free to make its choice both of good and evil.

I adhere to all I have said in that booklet and I would certainly recommend it to the reader. Government over self is the truest Swaraj, it is synonymous with *Moksha* or salvation, and I have seen nothing to alter the view that doctors, lawyers, and railways are no help, and are often a hindrance, to the one thing worth striving after. But I know that association with a satanic activity, such as the Government is engaged in, makes even an effort for such freedom a practical impossibility. I cannot tender allegiance to God and Satan at the same time.

The surest sign of the satanic nature of the present system is that even a nobleman of the type of Lord Ronaldshay is obliged to put us off the track. He will not deal with the one thing needful. Why is he silent about the Punjab? Why does he evade the Khilafat? Can ointments soothe a patient who is suffering from corroding consumption? Does his Lordship not see that it is not the inadequacy of the reforms that has set India aflame, but that it is the infliction of the two wrongs and the wicked attempt to make us forget them? Does he not see that a complete change of heart is required before reconciliation?

But it has become the fashion nowadays to ascribe hatred to non-co-operationism. And I regret to find that even Col Wedgwood has fallen into the trap. I make bold to say that the only way to remove hatred is

to give it disciplined vent. No man can—I cannot—perform the impossible task of removing hatred so long as contempt and despise for the feelings of India are sedulously nursed. It is a mockery to ask India not to hate when in the same breath India's most sacred feelings are contemptuously brushed aside. India feels weak and helpless and so expresses her helplessness by hating the tyrant who despises her and makes her crawl on the belly, lifts the veils of her innocent women and compels her tender children to acknowledge his power by saluting his flag four times a day. The gospel of non-co-operation addresses itself to the task of making the people strong and self-reliant. It is an attempt to transform hatred into pity.

A strong and self-reliant India will cease to hate Bosworth Smiths and Frank Johnsons, for she will have the power to punish them and therefore the power also to pity and forgive them. To-day she can neither punish nor forgive, and therefore helplessly nurses hatred. If the Mussalmans were strong, they would not hate the English but would fight and wrest from them the dearest possessions of Islam. I know that the Ali Brothers who live only for the honour and the prestige of Islam, and are prepared any moment to die for it, will to-day make friends with the latter, Englishmen, if they were to do justice to the Khilafat which it is in their power to do.

I am positively certain that there is no personal element in this fight. Both the Hindus and the Mahomedans would to-day invoke blessings on the English if they would but give proof positive of their goodness, faithfulness and loyalty to India. Non-co-operation then is a gods-

end. it will purify and strengthen India; and a strong India will be a strength to the world as an India weak and helpless is a curse to mankind. Indian soldiers have involuntarily helped to destroy Turkey and are now destroying the flower of the great Arabian nation. I cannot recall a single campaign in which the Indian soldier has been employed by the British Government for the good of mankind. And yet, (Oh! the shame of it!) Indian Maharajas are never tired of priding themselves on the loyal help they have rendered the English. Could degradation sink any lower?

‘HIND SWARAJ’

OR

THE INDIAN HOME-RULE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 26, 1921)

It is certainly my good fortune that this booklet of mine is receiving wide attention. The original is in Gujarati. It had a chequered career. It was first published in the columns of the *Indian Opinion* of South Africa. It was written in 1908 during my return voyage from London to South Africa in answer to the Indian school of violence, and its prototype in South Africa. I came in contact with every known Indian anarchist in London. Their bravery impressed me, but I feel that their zeal was misguided. I felt that violence

to give it disciplined vent. No man can—I cannot—perform the impossible task of removing hatred so long as contempt and despise for the feelings of India are sedulously nursed. It is a mockery to ask India not to hate when in the same breath India's most sacred feelings are contemptuously brushed aside. India feels weak and helpless and so expresses her helplessness by hating the tyrant who despises her and makes her crawl on the belly, lifts the veils of her innocent women and compels her tender children to acknowledge his power by saluting his flag four times a day. The gospel of non-co-operation addresses itself to the task of making the people strong and self-reliant. It is an attempt to transform hatred into pity.

A strong and self-reliant India will cease to hate Bosworth Smiths and Frank Johnsons, for she will have the power to punish them and therefore the power also to pity and forgive them. To-day she can neither punish nor forgive, and therefore helplessly nurses hatred. If the Mussalmans were strong, they would not hate the English but would fight and wrest from them the dearest possessions of Islam. I know that the Ali Brothers who live only for the honour and the prestige of Islam, and are prepared any moment to die for it, will to-day make friends with the latter, Englishmen, if they were to do justice to the Khilafat which it is in their power to do.

I am positively certain that there is no personal element in this fight. Both the Hindus and the Mahomedans would to-day invoke blessings on the English if they would but give proof positive of their goodness, faithfulness and loyalty to India. Non-co-operation then is a gods-

end. it will purify and strengthen India; and a strong India will be a strength to the world as an India weak and helpless is a curse to mankind. Indian soldiers have involuntarily helped to destroy Turkey and are now destroying the flower of the great Arabian nation. I cannot recall a single campaign in which the Indian soldier has been employed by the British Government for the good of mankind. And yet, (Oh! the shame of it!) Indian Maharajas are never tired of priding themselves on the loyal help they have rendered the English ' Could degradation sink any lower ?

'HIND SWARAJ'

OR

THE INDIAN HOME-RULE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 26, 1921)

It is certainly my good fortune that this booklet of mine is receiving wide attention. The original is in Gujarati. It had a chequered career. It was first published in the columns of the *Indian Opinion* of South Africa. It was written in 1908 during my return voyage from London to South Africa in answer to the Indian school of violence, and its prototype in South Africa. I came in contact with every known Indian anarchist in London. Their bravery impressed me, but I feel that their zeal was misguided I felt that violence

was no remedy for India's ill, and that her civilisation required the use of a different and higher weapon for self-protection. The *Satyagrah* of South Africa was still an infant hardly two years old. But it had developed sufficiently to permit me to write of it with some degree of confidence. It was so much appreciated that it was published as a booklet. It attracted some attention in India. The Bombay Government prohibited its circulation. I replied by publishing its translation. I thought that it was due to my English friends that they should know its contents. In my opinion it is a book which can be put into the hands of a child. It teaches the gospel of love in the place of that of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It pits soul-force against brute-force. It has gone through several editions and I commend it to those who would care to read it. I withdraw nothing except one word of it, and that in deference to a lady friend, I have given the reason for the alteration in the preface to the Indian edition.

The booklet is a severe condemnation of 'modern civilization.' It was written in 1908. My conviction is deeper to-day than ever. I feel that if India would discard 'modern civilization,' she can only gain by doing so.

But I would warn the reader against thinking that I am to-day aiming at the Swaraj described therein. I know that India is not ripe for it. It may seem an impertinence to say so. But such is my conviction. I am individually working for the self-rule pictured therein. But to-day my corporate activity is undoubtedly

devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of the people of India. I am not aiming at destroying railways or hospitals, though I would certainly welcome their natural destruction. Neither railways nor hospitals are a test of a high and pure civilization. At best they are a necessary evil. Neither adds one inch to the moral stature of a nation. Nor am I aiming at a permanent destruction of law courts, much as I regard it as a 'consummation devoutly to be wished for.' Still less am I trying to destroy all machinery and mills. It requires a higher simplicity and renunciation than the people are to-day prepared for.

The only part of the programme which is now being carried out in its entirety is that of non-violence. But I regret to have to confess that even that is not being carried out in the spirit of the book. If it were, India would establish Swaraj in a day. If India adopted the doctrine of love as an active part of her religion and introduced it in her politics, Swaraj would descend upon India from heaven. But I am painfully aware that that event is far off as yet.

I offer these comments because I observe that much is being quoted from the booklet to discredit the present movement. I have even seen writings suggesting that I am playing a deep game, that I am using the present turmoil to foist my fads on India and am making religious experiments at India's expense. I can only answer that *Satyagrah* is made of sterner stuff. There is nothing reserved and nothing secret in it. A portion

of the whole theory of life described in Hind Swaraj is undoubtedly being carried into practice. There is no danger attendant upon the whole of it being practised. But it is not right to scare away people by reproducing from my writings passages that are irrelevant to the issue before the country.

THE CONDITIONS OF SWARAJ

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

(*February 23, 1921*)

Swaraj is easy of attainment before October next if certain simple conditions can be fulfilled. I ventured to mention one year in September last because I knew that the conditions were incredibly simple and I felt that the atmosphere in the country was responsive. Past five months' experience has confirmed me in the opinion. I am convinced that the country has never been so ready for establishing Swaraj as now.

But it is necessary for us as accurately as possible to know the conditions. One supreme indispensable condition is the continuance of non-violence. Rowdysm, hooliganism, looting that we have recently witnessed are disturbing elements. They are danger-signals. We must be able to arrest their progress. The spirit of democracy cannot be established in a year in the midst of terrorism whether governmental or popular. In some

respects popular terrorism is more antagonistic to the growth of the democratic spirit than the governmental. For the latter strengthens the spirit of democracy, whereas the former kills it. Dyerism has evoked a yearning after freedom as nothing else has. But internal Dyerism, representing as it will terrorism by a majority, will establish an oligarchy such as will stifle the spirit of all free discussion and conduct. Non-violence, therefore, as against the Government and as between ourselves is absolutely essential to speedy success. And we must be able to devise means of observing it on our part in spite of the gravest provocations.

The next condition is our ability to bring into being the Congress organisation in terms of the new constitution, which aims at establishing a Congress agency in every village with a proper electorate. It means both money and ability to give effect to Congress policies. What is really needed is not a large measure of sacrifice but ability to organise and to take simple concerted action. At the present moment we have not even succeeded in carrying the Congress message to every home in the $7\frac{1}{2}$ lacs of villages of India. To do this work means at least 250 honest workers for as many districts, who have influence in their respective districts and who believe in the Congress programme. No village, no circle need wait for instructions from headquarters for founding their respective organisations.

There are certain things that are applicable to all. The most potent thing is Swadeshi. Every home must have the spinning wheel and every village can organise itself in less than a month and become self-supporting

for its cloth. Just imagine what this silent revolution means, and there would be no difficulty in sharing my belief that Swadeshi means *Swaraj* and *Swadharma*.

Every man and woman can give some money—be it even a pice—to the Tilak-Swaraj Fund. And we need have no anxiety about financing the movement. Every man and woman can deny himself or herself all luxury, all ornamentation, all intoxicants at least for one year. And we shall have not only money but we shall have boycotted many foreign articles. Our civilization, our culture, our Swaraj depend not upon multiplying our wants self indulgence but upon restricting our wants—self-denial.

We can do nothing without Hindu-Muslim unity and without killing the snake of untouchability. Untouchability is a corroding poison that is eating into the vitals of Hindu society. *Varnashram* is not a religion of superiority and inferiority. No man of God can consider another man as inferior to himself. He must consider every man as his blood-brother. It is the cardinal principle of every religion.

If this is a religious battle, no argument is necessary to convince the reader that self-denial must be its supreme test. Khilafat cannot be saved, the Punjab humanity cannot be redressed, without godliness. Godliness means change of heart,—in political language changing the angle of vision. And such a change can come in a moment. My belief is, that India is ripe for that change.

Let us then rivet our attention on;—

- (1) Cultivating the spirit of non-violence,

- (2) Setting up Congress organisations in every village.
- (3) Introducing the spinning wheel in every home and manufacturing all the cloth, required for our wants, through the village weaver.
- (4) Collecting as much money as possible.
- (5) Promoting Hindu-Muslim unity and
- (6) Ridding Hinduism of the curse of untouchability and otherwise purifying ourselves by avoiding intoxicating drinks and drugs.

Have we honest, earnest, industrious, patriotic workers for this very simple programme? If we have, Swaraj will be established in India before next October.

THE OLD STORY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(March 16, 1921)

Whenever a great movement is going on, sensation-mongering becomes the order of the day. A newspaper placard in Lahore is reported to have announced in flaming letters that I had said in *Navajivan* that Swaraj would not be attained because Messrs. Shastriar and Paranjapye were insulted during the year. I have just read the back number of *Navajivan* and can find nothing in my writings warranting such a conclusion. Under the heading "Swaraj will be delayed," I have severely criticised the conduct of the audience at Mr. Sastriar's meetings in Bombay, and I said that conduct such as

this must put back the clock of progress. I have explained in the same article that but for such exhibition of rowdyism we should not take even one year to gain Swaraj. No one need feel anxious about my belief. I wish people will cease to think of what I believe and begin to believe something themselves. If I could infect India with the intensity of my belief, she can gain Swaraj to-day, for the will of a nation composed of three hundred million men and women acting in unison cannot be withstood by any power on earth.

But Sir William Vincent was good enough to inform the Assembly the other day that India could now become even like the Dominions because she would fall an easy prey to any power that chose to attack her, and if that did not happen she would be torn to pieces by internal strife. If it is true, it is the severest censure that can be pronounced upon British rule in India. I have however suggested before now that we need not be afraid either of foreign invasion or anarchy within. British rule has certainly emasculated us. Disarmament has reduced our fighting power, and the policy of 'divide and rule' certainly succeeded for a time in keeping Hindus and Muslims apart. Common misfortunes have however made us brothers in distress. We need not fear foreign invasion, if we refuse to wear foreign cloth, and exchange with foreign nations only such produce or manufacture as we choose. South Africa has a poor standing army and no navy. It is true that every Boer is a fighter. But it is not the fighting quality that has made South African whites one nation. It is consciousness of oneness and ability to die for their country

that has made them a nation. The consciousness of oneness is with us an ever-growing quality and with it must come the strength to die. This does not require training either in English schools or in Council halls, and I feel that India is realising her unity with the undreamt of velocity. I believe there is every probability of evolving sufficient consciousness of ability and strength to make our demand for immediate Swaraj irresistible. Let us not fear the bugbear of anarchy. In spite of a Pathan occasionally running amock in a Bombay street and a Mahant turning satan in Nankhana Saheb, we are essentially good and inoffensive by nature. And when the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, the Rajputs and the Pathans fell as one nation, we have, if we want it, fighting material enough to give battle to any number of bandits who may wish to despoil us without any cause being given by us. It is the poisonous teaching that we are helpless, sedulously instilled into us by our rulers, that makes my soul rise against the system they have heartlessly administered for so many years. It is this belief of ours in our helplessness which makes the clock of progress go slow. It is strange that we are in bondage. It would be natural for us to feel free to-day.

A CROP OF DIFFICULTIES

BY M. K. GANDHI

(December 15, 1921)

A Bihar correspondent who gives his name writes as follows :—

I was to some extent considered to be a zealous worker in the cause of our country's welfare. I had sided with non-co-operation with full belief that it was religiously compulsory upon every Moslem. I never deceived myself with any hope of India's regeneration through non-co-operation nor have I yet been persuaded to hope so. On the contrary I believed that we were to non-co-operate with the British Government at the sacrifice of our best interests. By this I do not mean that I consider non-co-operation to be less effective but I do most strongly say that our countrymen are not capable of adhering to it with perfect non-violence. I have had opportunities enough to see that your lieutenants are more anxious to make a name than do any good to the cause they stand for. I think the morale of the country has so far deteriorated that it is beyond possibility that our present generation can effectively practise non-co-operation with non-violence. Is it not strange that a responsible leader like yourself could shut his eyes to this apparent and abject condition of things ?

I have taxed my brain to the last degree to find the reason why we are in such a hurry about Swaraj. Of course to delay would be sinful if Swaraj was within our grip but after so much evidence of failures why do you still stick to dating the advent of Swaraj by months ? If it was only to rouse the teeming masses, I am afraid the idea was not well conceived as is clear from recent happenings. To give out absurd hopes is nothing but playing with people's passion.

I make bold to beseech you in the interest of India and Indians to make a halt. Let us first train the countrymen and then march them to do battle. We have begun the fight with bad soldiers. It is better to accept defeat for next offensive than defend with such conditions. I am sure God's laws are just, and therefore Islam makes it conditional

to see the capacity before taking up any thing. The pilgrimage to Mecca is one of the five Fundamentals of Islam but not for all and sundry. To work for Swaraj, i e., freedom of one's country, ought to be one of our foremost duties but is it not cruelty to try us far beyond our capacity? I am afraid this hurry is at the root of most of the mischief done.

I should like to hear through *Young India* your views

He is a well known Bihari. There is no doubt about his honesty. I therefore gladly respond to his suggestion to give a public reply to his letter. Though non-co-operation was in the first instance conceived in connection with the Khilafat, neither I nor my first associates ever thought that non-co-operation with the British Government involved any sacrifice whatsoever of the country's interests. On the contrary we believed that if we could compel surrender to the just demands of the Mussalmans of India regarding the Khilafat, we could also compel surrender in the matter of the Punjab and consequently in the matter of Swaraj. Non-violence was believed from the very commencement to be an integral part of non-co-operation, and if the former failed the latter failed *ipso facto*. Indeed the recent happenings have furnished abundant proof of the progress of non-violence. They show, I hope conclusively, that Bombay's aberration was an isolated instance in no way symptomatic of the general condition of the country. A year ago it would have been impossible for the Government to arrest so many leaders of the front rank in so many parts of the country leaving the people absolutely self-controlled. It would be a mistake to suppose that it is the machine-gun which has kept all the people under restraint. No doubt

it has its share, but he who runs may see that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of people in India to whom machine guns have ceased to be a terror. Nor I can subscribe to the doctrine that the country has suffered deterioration. On the contrary every province can demonstrate the marvellous revolution brought about by this movement of purification in the lives of people. A distinguished Mussalman friend was telling me only the other day how the younger generation of Mussalmans was reclaimed from a life of indolent and atheistical luxury to one of religious simplicity and industry.

We are certainly in a hurry to get Swaraj. Who can help it? Were the Moplahs in the death wagon in a hurry when in their asphyxiated state they were crying out for a breath of fresh air and a drink of water? The death wagon of foreign domination in which we are suffering from moral asphyxiation is infinitely worse than the Moplah death wagon. And the wonder is that all these long years we have not felt the want of the oxygen of liberty. But having known our state, is it not most natural for us to cry out for the fresh air of Swaraj? I am unable to accept any blame for having set the time limit. I would have been wrong not to do so, knowing as I did that if the people fulfilled the conditions which were capable of easy fulfilment, Swaraj was a certainty inside of twelve months. If the atmosphere of non-violence is truly established, I make bold to say that we shall achieve the substance even during the remaining days of this year, though we might have to wait for the form yet a

while. The time limit was not fixed in order to rouse the teeming millions, but it was fixed in order to rivet the attention of Congressmen and Congresswomen on their sense of immediate duty and on the grand consequence of its fulfilment. Without the time limit we would not have collected the crore nor would we have introduced so many spinning wheels, nor manufactured thousands of rupees worth of handspun *Khadi* and distributed lakhs amongst the poorest workers in the country. It is not a sign of bad soldiery to find Bengal, the United Provinces, and the Punjab supplying prisoners as fast as Government can take them. And when the word is passed round the other provinces for repression of a violent type, I doubt not that they will shine just as brilliantly as the three fortunate ones I have mentioned.

INDEPENDENCE

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 5, 1922)

Maulana Hasrat Mohani put up a plucky fight for independence on the Congress platform and then as President of the Muslim League and was happily each time defeated. There is no mistake about the meaning of the Maulana. He wants to sever all connection with the British people even as partners and equals and even though the Khilafat question be satisfactorily solved. It will not do to urge that the Khilafat question can never

be solved without complete independence. We are discussing merely the theory. It is common cause that if the Khilfat question cannot be solved without complete independence, *i. e.*, if the British people retain hostile attitude towards the aspirations of the Islamic world, there is nothing left for us to do but to insist upon complete independence. India cannot afford to give Britain even her moral support and must do without Britain's support, moral and material, if she cannot be induced to be friendly to the Islamic world.

But assuming that Great Britain alters her attitude as I know she will when India is strong, it will be religiously unlawful for us to insist on independence. For it will be vindictive and petulant. It would amount to a denial of God, for the refusal will then be based upon the assumption that the British people are not capable of response to the God in man. Such a position is untenable for both a believing Mussalman and a believing Hindu.

India's greatest glory will consist not in regarding Englishmen as her implacable enemies fit only to be turned out of India at the first available opportunity but in turning them into friends and partners in a new commonwealth of nations in the place of an Empire based upon exploitation of the weaker or undeveloped nations and races of the earth and therefore finally upon force.

Let us see clearly what Swaraj together with the British connection means. It means undoubtedly India's ability to declare her independence if she wishes. Swaraj

therefore will not be a free gift of the British Parliament. It will be a declaration of India's full self-expression. That it will be expressed through an Act of Parliament is true. But it will be merely a courteous ratification of the declared wish of the people of India even as it was in the case of the Union of South Africa. Not an unnecessary adverb in the Union scheme could be altered by the House of Commons. The ratification in our case will be of a treaty to which Britain will be party.

Such Swaraj may not come this year, may not come within our generation. But I have contemplated nothing less. The British Parliament, when the settlement comes, will ratify the wishes of the people of India as expressed not through the bureaucracy but through her freely chosen representatives.

Swaraj can never be a free gift by one nation to another. It is a treasure to be purchased with a nation's best blood. It will cease to be a gift when we have paid dearly for it. The Viceroy was confused when he said that Swaraj would have to come from the Parliament unless it came by the sword. He paid no compliment to his country when he allowed his audience to infer that England was incapable of listening to the moral pressure of suffering, and he insulted the intelligence of his audience if he wished it to understand that the British Parliament would give Swaraj when it wished irrespective of India's desires and aspirations. The fact is that Swaraj will be a fruit of incessant labour, suffering beyond measure.

But His Excellency is unused to any substitute for the sword and therefore does probably think that by

exercising our debating skill in the legislative councils, some day or other we shall be able to impress the British Parliament with the desirability of granting us Swaraj. He will soon learn that there is a better and more effective substitute for the sword and that is civil disobedience. It is daily becoming increasingly clear that civil disobedience will afford the course of suffering through which India must pass before she comes to her own.

We have not come to our own. There is still mutual distrust between Mussalmans and Hindus. The untouchables have not yet felt the glow of the Hindu touch. The Parsis and the Christians of India do not yet know their future under Swaraj to a certainty. We have not yet learnt the art nor realised the necessity of obeying our own laws. The spinning wheel has not yet found a permanent place in our homes. *Khadi* has not yet become the national garment. In other words, we have not yet understood the art or the conditions of self-protection.

There is still a body of opinion diminishing in volume but not yet negligible which considers that violence alone will bring Swaraj to us and that therefore violence might be permitted to continue side by side with non-violence, *i. e.*, our non-violence should be regarded as merely a prelude to and a preparation for violence. Those who hold these views little know that their attitude constitutes a fraud upon the world. Our pledge requires that whilst we are under it we believe in the efficacy of non-violence for the quickest attainment of our goal. Each one of us is under a sacred obligation

to cancel the pledge as soon as he believes that Swaraj is unattainable by non-violence or except by violence. Non-violence is a creed while it lasts. It is an expedient because it is an experiment. But whilst we are under the pledge we are not only bound to believe in and observe non-violence but we are equally bound to persuade others to be non-violent and condemn those who do violence. I am more than ever convinced that we have not reached our goal because even we who have subscribed to the Congress creed have not all remained non-violent in word and deed nor endeavoured to be non-violent in thought or intent.

Part IX

The Congress

THE NATIONAL WEEK

(January 7, 1920)

The Congress session* was a long session. It commenced on the 26th December and went on to the New Year's day with a day's break to enable the contractors to dry the pandal ground which had become too damp for use by reason of the rains. But for the importance of the matters it had to handle it was none too unduly prolonged. Much time was given to the Subjects Committee. That was but right. If the Congress resolutions are to carry weight they must be well thought out and thoroughly discussed.

Side by side with the Congress took place the All-India Muslim League Conference, the Khilafat Conference, the Sikh Conference, the Humanitarian Conference, Social Conference, the Temperance Conference, etc. We doubt whether it is sound wisdom to press all national work into one week. Conferences which cannot attract people for their special objects are not worth having. We would, if we could, have a separate occasion and time even for so important a fixture as the Social Conference. And there may be

* At Amritsar.

no reason why the most important social evils may not occupy the attention of the national assembly itself. But here we are treading on dangerous ground. It is sufficient for the time being to point out that the side-shows that are arranged every year result only in detracting attention from the main theme. And three or four days in a year are none too many for discussing and forming conclusions on weighty political matters.

The All-India Muslim League must be the only exception to the rule we have endeavoured to lay down. It is a sign of an ever-growing desire for fraternity to have the two assemblies during the same week in the year. It enables the two great races to come closer together and to have an exchange of opinions. So long as it is necessary to emphasise the need for fraternisation, so long as there is yet distrust and there are causes of collision between the two races, so long must there be these two assemblies. We can but long for the day when the Congress fulfils the highest aspirations of the Mahomedans as of the Hindus. Meanwhile we must be thankful for the fact that both the functions take place at the same place and time, specially for the purpose of promoting harmony between the two communities.

By far the most important resolution of the Muslim Conference from the Hindu standpoint was that recommending the stoppage of cow killing on the Bakr 'Id. It reflects the greatest credit on the organisers of the Conference and on Hakimji Ajmal Khan to have secured the unanimous passage of that resolution. Nothing can bring the two communities to-

gether as this one big step by our Mahomedan countrymen. That the Hindus offer their assistance in the Khilafat question is not half as weighty as this cow-protecting resolution. For the Mahomedans to do so means, undoubtedly, some sacrifice. For reasons we need not go into, cow-slaughter on Bakr Id was being treated almost as a religious necessity and we have no doubt that some good Maulvies even now consider that the resolution is a backward step. It was therefore but proper that the Congress should have passed a resolution embodying its grateful sentiments in becomingly warm terms. It is said that when the news of the resolution was first received in the Subjects Committee tent, the members were so deeply stirred that they received the news standing in order to show their thankfulness.

Besides the resolutions discussed in our leading columns there were many resolutions adopted by the Congress which must attract attention. The resolution of Lord Chelmsford's recall for instance was a momentous one. Those who are in the know tell us that it was not possible to avoid it. The feeling was so strong against Lord Chelmsford's rule, that the people would not listen to postpone the resolution till after the Punjab reports were out. The contention put forward by those who insisted on the resolution being passed during the present session, was that Lord Chelmsford proved his unfitness for rule, without the necessity of waiting for the reports. 'Look how he sent a Government despatch which, if it had not been checkmated by the memorandum of the famous nineteen, might have dashed

a nation's hope to pieces, how he insulted an important deputation, how he endorsed Lord Pentland's regime, how he supported Sir Michael O'Dwyer, and above all how he placed himself in opposition to the whole country by insisting the Rowlatt Bill insanity'.

Thus argued the protagonists of the resolution. The Hon'ble Mr. Sarma put up a brave but weak defence. For our part we believe that the resolution might gracefully have been put off. But there is no doubt that His Excellency has not signalised his rule by any great outstanding act of national advancement to counter-balance his many mistakes. And a nation has the right, without being rude or offensive, to ask for the recall of the ruler whom it considers to be unfit. But the nation, we are sorry to say, was even rude through its representatives. The speeches delivered in support of the resolution were mostly rude and offensive. The speakers would have added to the dignity of the proceedings if they had restrained themselves. To speak of a King's representative as 'a 3rd class subaltern of no parts' is hardly a phrase that can be defended. Or to talk of the 'crimes and misdemeanours' of Lord Chelmsford is not to appreciate the position either of our own or that of Lord Chelmsford.

We shall add no lustre to our national existence by resorting to thoughtless or discursive speech. We have most difficult times ahead of us. And those who have the gift of speech and wish to serve the country render doubtful service by being reckless in their speech.

The speakers lost sense of proportion in assessing

the Viceroy's blemishes. A man may be unfit and yet good. We hold that Lord Chelmsford's mistakes were those of the head. He failed to perceive the difference between a purely constitutional figure-head that a Governor is in the self-governing Colonies and between the Viceroy of India who enjoys almost absolute powers. He failed to exercise his undoubted right of prompt intervention in cases of known wrongs. He did not respond to the growing consciousness of the nation. There are limitations which contribute to failure without making one a criminal. We can ask for Lord Chelmsford's recall even though we admit, as we must, that he is a highly cultured English gentleman. But our purpose is not so much to find out the good points of Lord Chelmsford, as it is to show that however bad he may be, it was not gentlemanly for us to use the language that was used regarding His Excellency. And we desire to express our deep sorrow that from a national platform unbecoming and rude language should have been used by responsible speakers about the highest representative of the Crown in India.

The resolutions regarding Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer were only to be expected. It was certainly an affront to India to have sent back Sir Michael O'Dwyer to fill a position of responsibility. It would have been at least prudent not to have needlessly irritated public opinion by having sent him back to India. Mr. Montagu's imagination failed him when he selected Sir Michael for his military mission.

Of General Dyer, the less said the better. He may

be ever so good a soldier. A soldier in Wordsworth's sense he has certainly not proved to be. Dictates of humanity, if nothing else, demand that he should not have the opportunity of trying his atrocious formulæ in other parts of the world, among other nations and certainly not where his actions cannot even be known as they could be in an important centre like Amritsar. We dread to think of what soldiers like General Dyer must be doing across the Frontier where there is no check upon a soldier's license save what he chooses to impose upon himself.

THE CONGRESS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(January 7, 1920)

The Congress this time was for many of us a pilgrimage because of its having been held in Amritsar. Jallianwala Bagh was visited during the Congress week by the thousands of delegates and visitors with the pilgrim mind. It is said that some¹ touched the blood-stained earth with their foreheads, some took away with them a little of that earth to be preserved as a sacred treasure. Some used it as *vibhuti*, and smeared their foreheads with it. All went to the Bagh as a sacred duty. There is no doubt many went to the Congress only as a mark of their respect for the memory of the innocent dead.

The speeches of Swami Shri Shraddhanandji, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, and of the Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru were models of sobriety and breathed an earnest spirit. Each bore the individuality of its author. The Swami's had a religious ring about it. He was full of good-will towards mankind. "How can we hate Englishmen if we love Andrews, Wedderburn, Hume, Hardinge and others? We must conquer the English with our love," said the Swami. The Pandit's language, though perfectly courteous and restrained, is bitter. He compels a tear from the eye as he takes you with him through the different acts of the Punjab tragedy. He has examined the events of the Punjab with his legal acumen. Iron has entered his soul. He demands stern justice against the culprits.

The Presidential speech suffers for being in English. It was painful to see him labouring through his speech, spoken in a foreign tongue before an audience of nearly 15,000 people not one-seventh of which could follow his English. The Congress proceedings have conclusively demonstrated the necessity of their being mainly, if not entirely, conducted in Hindi. That is the only course left open to us, if we would work for the masses and draw upon them for delegates. In the Central Provinces, the United Provinces, Delhi, the Punjab and Behar, only Hindustani is spoken and in all the other parts of India except the Presidency of Madras, Hindi can be generally understood. For it is a language cognate to the vernaculars of the other provinces. Madras alone presents any difficulty and for the sake of a few

hundred delegates from that Presidency, it would not be proper to do violence to thousands who cannot understand English, but who can more or less understand Hindustani. The only straight, economical and politically sound course is to make the proceedings of the Congress predominantly Hindustani, the Dravidian members being free to speak in English, or for that matter, in Tamil or Telugu. I grant that for a few years, the Subjects Committee must deliberate in English, but if we are to give a proper political education to the country through the medium of the Congress, it must be clear to every one that it can only be done through Hindi. I trust, therefore, that those in the Madras Presidency who are desirous of doing All-India public work outside their Presidency and of aspiring after becoming delegates of the Congress will make haste to learn Hindi. They have got facilities in the Madras Presidency for learning Hindi, and if they will begin now and give at least one hour per day regularly to it, they will, by the end of the year, be able generally to follow the proceedings of the Congress. All must recognise that the insistent demand of the delegates from year to year for Hindustani cannot be resisted for any length of time.

Another absurdity which is becoming more and more grave needs also to be removed. Very few people could follow the President while he was reading his speech. The very best of leaders may not occupy the attention of the audience for longer than an hour. The President's address was necessarily long. It occupied thirty-eight foolscap pages in print. Fortunately Pandit

Nehru skipped over many pages whilst he was reading it, but he would have taken no less than three hours if he had insisted on reading the whole of the thirty-eight pages. It is highly necessary, therefore, that the addresses of the Chairman of the Reception Committee and the President should be printed in Hindustani (both in Devanagari and Urdu scripts), English and the vernacular of the province in which the Congress is held, and distributed at the entrance either gratis or for the cost price. They ought not to be distributed in the pandal, as is often done much to the inconvenience of everybody. Both the Chairman and the President might read or orally give the summary of their addresses, each occupying no longer than thirty minutes.

The third absurdity is the terrible, evergrowing waste of money in creating a huge pandal. The Indian climate admits of holding meetings in the open air. But I refrain from saying more on this matter as the All-India Congress Committee has appointed a sub-committee consisting of Messrs. Kelkar, I. B. Sen, A. Rangaswami Iyengar, the Hon'ble V. J. Patel and myself to consider the whole constitution of the Congress.

The resolutions of the Congress show that there are very sharp divisions and as time goes forward, parties are inevitable. Hitherto the Congress has represented only one party, but it cannot be kept any longer as one party organisation, if it is not to have seceders from it on an increasing scale from year to year. Measures must be devised whereby all parties can be represented on it and the annual assembly can retain its truly national character.

Let us consider the resolutions. Take the condemnation of the excesses. There is no doubt that without that resolution some of the resolutions would have lost all force and value. We could not with any justification condemn the excesses of the authorities and therefore urge the dismissal of General Dyer or Sir Michael O'Dwyer, or even the Viceroy's recall, if we were not ready to condemn our own. That resolution was the necessary *prayaschitta* for the mob frenzy in April. If we are to make orderly progress, we must unequivocally disapprove of violence being committed by the people in any shape or form. It is true that often in the West mob violence is resorted to, but by creating a strong popular opinion against it, we must make such violence impossible in India. Few can deny that on the sixth of April, India found itself in possession of a new force and a new power—a force that could prove irresistible under almost every conceivable circumstance provided that truth was on our side. It is my firm belief that had the development of Satyagraha not been interrupted in April by our own folly, not only would the Rowlatt Act have been removed from the Statute Book but we would have been spared the humiliating and degrading spectacle of a British general running amock. Indeed we shall find it impossible, when we have full control over our national affairs, to carry on the government of the country without self-restraint. In a vast country like India where the people are ordinarily peaceful, we shall find it impossible to carry on the government if mob rule becomes the custom of the land, and in order to check that tendency, popular opinion is a far greater

and more potent instrument than the employment of physical force. I would, therefore, give the first place in point of importance to this resolution as a token of the correctness of our conduct and for the sake of a lead to the country. These resolutions of the Congress, especially those that require any action on the part of the people, are valuable for the formation of public opinion, and I hope that workers recognizing the full force of the truth underlying the resolution will on due occasion impress upon the people the necessity of refraining from violence.

Only less in importance than the resolution on condemnation was the resolution on Reforms. Whilst I subscribe entirely to the proposition that India is fit now for responsible government, I do not for one moment believe that we can get it without working for it. We can work either by adopting obstructive tactics or by co-operation. Healthy obstruction is a condition of our being. We must ever obstruct untruth, injustice and evil. It was because I did not consider, and do not consider, the Reforms to be an evil or unjust and because I consider them to be a progressive step towards responsible government, that I decline to consider them to be disappointing, however inadequate and unsatisfactory they may be. I endorse Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's opinion that for me to decline to consider the Reforms disappointing means that I did not expect them. I had certainly much fear that the Reforms might not go through when they did and I was unprepared for material improvements in the measures as it was originally published. The opponents of the amendment

admitted that they would co-operate when co-operation was essential for the country's good and not hesitate to obstruct when obstruction advanced it. That no doubt was the only meaning, and no other, of the amendment of which I had the honour to be in charge. But let it be said to the credit of the opponents that they resisted the amendments as long as they could, because they frankly said that they had a faith in the bureaucracy even under the altered conditions. In my humble opinion, it is a wrong attitude. The Royal Proclamation has been framed in a most liberal spirit. It is full of good-will and it would have been wrong on the part of the Congress not to have responded to the King's call for co-operation. My faith in human nature is irrepressible and even under the circumstances of a most adverse character, I have found Englishmen amenable to reason and persuasion, and as they always wish to appear to be just even when they are in reality unjust, it is easier to shame them than others into doing the right thing. Be that however as it may, it would be a fall from our culture and it would be unwise not to grasp the hand of fellowship extended through the Proclamation. If we are strong, we shall lose nothing by beginning with co-operation. We at once place the bureaucracy in the wrong by our readiness to co-operate for the common purpose.

It was equally important for us to thank Mr. Montagu for his valuable services in connection with the Reforms. The Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah and I therefore felt that even at the risk of dividing the house we were bound to press

the amendment home. That ultimately there was a compromise shows the good nature of Lokamanya Tilak and Mr. Das. It was a perfect pleasure to see both of them, whilst holding to their views, anxious not to divide the house. And it was equally a pleasure to see so many on the platform working to secure a compromise.

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November , 1920)

The belated report of the Congress Constitution Committee has now been published for general information, and opinion has been invited from all public bodies in order to assist the deliberations of the All-India Congress Committee. It is a pity that, small though the Constitution Committee was, all the members never met at any one time in spite of efforts to have a meeting of them all. It is perhaps nobody's fault that all the members could not meet. At the same time, the draft report has passed through the searching examination of all but one member, and the report represents the mature deliberations of four out of the five members. It must be stated at the same time that it does not pretend to be the unanimous opinion of the members. Rather than present a dissenting minute, workable scheme has been brought out leaving each member free to press his own views on the several matters in which they are not quite unani-

mous. The most important part of the constitution, however, is the alteration of the creed. So far as I am aware, there is no fundamental difference of opinion between the members. In my opinion, the altered creed represents the exact feeling of the country at the present moment.

I know that the proposed alteration has been subjected to hostile criticism in several newspapers of note. But the extraordinary situation that faces the country is that popular opinion is far in advance of several newspapers which have hitherto commanded influence and have undoubtedly moulded public opinion. The fact is that the formation of opinion to-day is by no means confined to the educated classes, but the masses have taken it upon themselves not only to formulate opinion but to enforce it. It would be a mistake to belittle or ignore this opinion; or to ascribe it to a temporary upheaval. It would be equally a mistake to suppose that this awakening amongst the masses is due either to the activity of the Ah Brothers or myself. For the time being we have the ear of the masses because we voice their sentiments. The masses are by no means so foolish or unintelligent as we sometimes imagine. They often perceive things with their intuition, which we ourselves fail to see with our intellect. But whilst the masses know what they want, they often do not know how to express their wants and, less often, how to get what they want. Herein comes the use of leadership, and disastrous results can easily follow a bad, hasty, or what is worse, selfish lead.

The first part of the proposed creed expresses the

present desire of the nation, and the second shows the way that desire can be fulfilled. In my humble opinion, the Congress creed with the proposed alteration is but an extension of the original. And so long as no break with the British connection is attempted, it is strictly within even the existing article that defines the Congress Creed. The extension lies in the contemplated possibility of a break with the British connection. In my humble opinion, if India is to make unhampered progress, we must make it clear to the British people that whilst we desire to retain the British connection, if we can rise to our full height with it, we are determined to dispense with, and even to get rid of that connection, if that is necessary for full national development. I hold that it is not only derogatory to national dignity, but it actually impedes national progress superstitiously to believe that our progress towards our goal is impossible without British connection. It is this superstition which makes some of the best of us tolerate the Punjab wrong and the Khilafat insult. This blind adherence to that connection makes us feel helpless. The proposed alteration in the creed enables us to rid ourselves of our helpless condition. I personally hold that it is perfectly constitutional openly to strive after independence but lest there may be dispute as to the constitutional character of any movement for complete independence, the doubtful and highly technical adjective "constitutional" has been removed from the altered creed in the draft. Surely it should be enough to ensure that the methods for achieving our end are legitimate, honourable, and peaceful. I believe that this was the reasoning that

guided my colleagues in accepting the proposed creed. In any case, such was certainly my view of the whole alteration. There is no desire on my part to adopt any means that are subversive of law and order. I know, however, that I am treading on delicate ground when I write about law and order, for, to some of our distinguished leaders even my present methods appear to be lawless and conducive to disorder. But even they will, perhaps, grant that the retention of the word 'constitutional' cannot protect the country against methods such as I am employing. It gives rise, no doubt, to a luminous legal discussion, but any such discussion, is fruitless when the nation means business. The other important alteration refers to the limitation of the number of delegates. Re-believe that the advantages of such a limitation are obvious. We are fast reaching a time when without any such limitation the Congress will become an unwieldy body. It is difficult even to have an unlimited number of visitors; it is impossible to transact national business if we have an unlimited number of delegates.

The next important alteration is about the election of the members of the All-India Congress Committee making that committee practically the Subject Committee and the redistribution of India for the purpose of the Congress on a linguistic basis. It is not necessary to comment on these alterations but I wish to add that, if the Congress accepts the principle of limiting the number of delegates, it would be advisable to introduce the principle of proportional representation. That would enable all parties, who wish to be represented at the Congress.

I observe that the *Servant of India* sees an inconsistency between my implied acceptance of the British Committee so far as the published draft constitution is concerned and my recent article in *Young India* on that Committee and the newspaper *India*. But it is well-known that for several years I have held my present views about the existence of that body. It would have been irrelevant for me, perhaps, to suggest to my colleagues the extinction of that committee. It was not our function to report on the usefulness or otherwise of the Committee. We were commissioned only for preparing a new constitution. Moreover, I knew that colleagues were not averse to the existence of the British Committee. And the drawing-up of a new constitution enabled me to show that, where there was no question of principle, I was desirous of agreeing quickly with my opponents in opinions. But I propose certainly to press for abolition of the Committee as it is at present constituted, and the stopping of its organ, *India*.

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 30, 1921*)

The last Congress has given a constitution whose working is in itself calculated to lead to Swaraj. It is intended to secure in every part of India representative committees working in conjunction with, and under

willing and voluntary submission to, a central organisation—The All-India Congress Committee. It establishes an adult suffrage open to men and women, subject only to two qualifications: singing of the creed and a nominal payment of four annas. It is intended to secure due representation of all parties and communities. If, then it is honestly worked, and commands confidence and respect, it can oust the present Government without the slightest difficulty. For, the latter has no power except through the co-operation, willing or forced, of the people. The force it exercises is almost through our own people. One lac of Europeans, without our help, can only hold less than one-seventh of our villages each, and it would be difficult, for one man, even when physically present, to impose his 'will on, say, four hundred men and women—the average population of an Indian village.

The problem before us, therefore, is one of opposing our will to that of the will of the Government, is other words to withdraw our co-operation from it. If we are united in purpose, the Government must obey our will or retire. It is the disturbing factors of which the Government avails itself for the consolidation of its power. When we are violent, it resorts to terrorism, when we are disunited it resorts to bribery; when we are united, it resorts to cajolery and conciliation; when we are clamant, it puts temperations in the way of those who cry out most. All, therefore, we need do is to remain non-violent, united, and unresponsive to bribery and cajolery.

Surely, there is not much education required to

accomplish this much among a people who are cultured and intelligent. It is not difficult to present to them a common purpose and a common platform which they can appreciate and understand. But this means not talking, but acting and organising. I suggest that we concentrate on registering before the 30th June, in an accurate manner, at least one crore of members in the Congress organisation. No registration is to be deemed complete without the payment of four annas and the acceptance of the creed. We must aim at enlisting every adult member of every family. It should be our boast to have as many women as men on our registers. We should have all the Mussalmans, all the castes, all the artisans, and all the pariahs, whom we can induce to come to our register. It will then become a most democratic register of voters that the world can show. If the suggestions made by me are acceptable, we have to concentrate our attention up to the 30th June on getting:—

- (1) One crore Rupees for the Tilak Swaraj fund.
- (2) One crore members on the Congress register.
- (3) The spinning wheel introduced in twenty lacs of homes

In order to register one crore members, I estimate that we shall have canvassed at least twenty lacs of homes, counting five member to a family. Workers can certainly persuade Congress families to take up one wheel per family. Twenty-five lacs of spinning wheels in twenty-one provinces, is not an ambitious scheme.

Let us not waste our resources in thinking of too many national problems and their solutions. A patient,

who tries many nostrums at a time, dies. A physician, who experiments on his patient with a combination of remedies, loses his reputation and passes for a quack. Chastity in work is as essential as chastity in life. All dissipation is bad. We have hitherto all pulled our own way, and thus wasted away national strength in a most extravagant manner. To boycott foreign cloth within the year is a practical feasibility. To bring into being a working organisation for the Congress is an easy thing for honest workers. The collection of one crore of rupees in a methodical manner will at once create confidence and will be a tangible token of our earnestness and determination.

This programme does not mean cessation of the other activities of non-co-operation. They go on. Drink and untouchability must vanish. The education movement is steadily going forward. The national institutions that have sprung up will, if they are efficiently managed, make headway and attract students who are still hesitating. The pleaders, always a cautious and calculating class by training, will, as they see the movement progressing more and more, fall in line with the rest of the country. Boycott of law courts by the public is making fair progress. These things do not now require concentration of universal effort. They apply to special classes. But the three things mentioned by me are the most essential: they must be done now, and without them the movement, as a mass movement, must be pronounced a failure.

THE BRITISH CONGRESS COMMITTEE
AND "INDIA"

BY M. K. GANDHI

(October 20, 1920)

I gladly reproduce in another column * an open letter sent to me by Miss Normanton. I do not know the lady save by her writings in India whilst it was being edited by her. Her views on non-co-operation are refreshingly strong and her unqualified support of the boycott of the reformed Councils ought to prove consoling to the waverers. But I would ask my reader not to overweigh the effect of the boycott on the British public or the League of Nations. It is better for us to rivet our attention on our own duty irrespective of the effect of its performance on outside opinion. We have overestimated the effect of our action on British public opinion and in doing so have often damaged the true interests of the nation. At the same time Miss Normanton's argument appears to me to be perfectly sound.

What will however interest the public more are perhaps her views on the British Committee. I do not know the merits of the controversy she discusses. But apart from the merits, her views on the constitution of the Committee would appear to be original. I entirely associate myself with her remark that a British Committee, to be true to the name, should be composed exclusively of the British people and financed by them. It is then more likely to exert influence on British public opinion than now.

* Omitted in this collection.

In any case we would then have a real index of the British interests in Indian affairs, I endorse Miss Normanton's views about the newspaper *India* also. The paper costs much more than it is worth. Its influence on English opinion is practically nothing and it is an indifferent vehicle of English opinion for India's enlightenment. Its only value therefore consists in its parliamentary reports which can be received and distributed by the All-India Congress Committee with very little cost. An enterprising newspaper could take over that duty any day and make it a paying venture. And now that we have embarked on non-co-operation and are determined to become self-reliant, it would be more consistent for us to disestablish the British Committee and stop *India*. It would save a needless waste of public money and turn our attention more towards ourselves,

It is not easy for me to reconcile myself to the alternative suggested by Miss Normanton viz. that we should have a kind of an advisory committee or an advisor or resident in London to help the proposed British Committee with suggestions. I would far rather concentrate all our attention and all our best workers on work in India. The harvest is truly rich and the labourers are few. We can ill-spare a single worker for foreign work. It will be time for us to consider the propriety of sending a representative abroad after we have created a permanent impression in India itself by substantial and solid work.

[We are in possession of further evidence, which we have received from another esteemed correspondent in

London in connection with the very unsatisfactory condition of the newspaper *India*. The total circulation of *India*, our correspondent informs us, is 500 only (!) 220 in Great Britain, the rest in India. Last year's income was £ 4-17-0 (!) only while the expenditure for the current year is estimated to £ 3,300. This is how our correspondent puts it :

For the maintenance of *India* we pay—that is the poor people in India pay—£ 1,800 a year, out of which Mr. Syed Hussain as Editor-secretary gets £ 550 a year with effect from October 1. Mr. Fenner Brockway as co-Editor-Secretary gets £ 550, Mr. G. P. Blizard as Secretary £ 400, the typist £ 150, clerk £ 150.

The paper has had a chequered career but was never a success from the propagandist point of view. It has never had a constructive policy. To squander £ 1800 on a 3 d. weekly with a circulation of 500, and to spend another £ 1500 on establishment charges, £ 3300 in all, looks like reckless extravagance.—Ed., *Y. I.*]

“INDIA” AND THE BRITISH COMMITTEE CONGRESS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*January 19, 1921*)

The *Chronicle*, I observe, calls the decision to end the British Committee and *India* an unfortunate decision. The argument advanced in support of the view is

that the Constitution Committee had not advised abolition of the British Committee and *India* and that both were doing good work. It is true that the Constitution Committee had not recommended abolition. But it should be remembered that the Committee was appointed at the Amritsar Congress and its report was conceived before the Non-co-operation resolution of the Special Congress. Much has happened since then to revolutionize the country's ideas about foreign propaganda and the British Committee. The abolition was a matter of principle. It was felt that a non-co-operation Congress could not keep a foreign agency for helping its work. The Congress has deliberately burnt its boats. It has decided to become self-reliant. The question of efficiency of the Committee as constituted becomes irrelevant. It is hardly dignified for the Congress in the altered situation to subsidise a foreign agency for doing propaganda work. No amount of misrepresentation about it could possibly blot out effective action by the nation.

Whether you advertise the fact or not, a body not receiving the food it needs dies. Whether we advertise the fact or not the moment we cease to support the government, it dies a natural death. Personally I dislike even the resolution voting the money to be used at the discretion of the All-India Congress Committee in foreign propaganda. We want all the money we need in this country. I would far rather invest Rs. 45,000 in spinning wheels or establishing primary schools than in wasting it in advertising our work. Every good deed is its own advertisement. And I shall certainly hope that

the money will still be saved for a better purpose. So far as the newspaper *India* is concerned, we are certainly better without it. It raised in us false hopes. The British people are as much on their honour and trial as we are. If they choose to be misinformed by interested or dishonest journals, we cannot help them. Have we not published the Congress Punjab report? Who believes it? Mr. Montagu discredits it and the British public echoes his opinion. In the art of advertising bogus things the British journalists are to be beaten only by the Americans. I would not enter into the unequal competition and court defeat.

[1] We must adopt new methods for combating the evils of sensational and untruthful journalism and public life. The Congress has given the lead by abolishing the Committee and its organ *India*.

THE WORKING COMMITTEE AND

ITS FUNCTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(June 29, 1921)

The resolutions of the Working Committee have come in for some hostile criticism. Its ruling questioning the propriety of non-co-operating lawyers attending law-courts and non-co-operating defendants entering upon their defence in law-courts, has been seriously called in question, and it has even been suggested, that

its rulings may be disregarded. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the function of the Working Committee. And before we can understand this, we must understand the Congress Constitution

The goal of the Congress is attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means. The Congress must be worked, so as to hasten India's progress towards her destined goal. The Constitution is so devised as to tax and prove the nation's capacity for self-government. It undoubtedly sets up a system of voluntary government, in which the only force available is public opinion and the good-will of the people. And seeing that the Congress is to-day engaged in opposing, and if need be, destroying the existing system, it follows that the greater the authority of the Congress, the less must be that of the Government. When the Congress commands complete confidence and *willing obedience* to its instructions, there is full Swaraj. For, then, the Government must respect popular opinion expressed through the Congress, or it must commit suicide. The Congress must, therefore, become the most united, the strongest in character and the largest organisation in the land. The Congress policy, therefore, must command the readiest acceptance.

The Congress meets in session only once a year. It lays down policies. The All-India Congress Committee is designed to carry out the Congress policy as embodied in its resolutions. It must interpret all resolutions, and attend to all new matters, with the same authority as the Congress. The members may debate upon different propositions and interpretations as much as they choose, but except on matters of vital

principle, the dissenters must conform to, and faithfully carry out, the resolutions of the majority. The discussions in the Committee are not open for re-discussion in public. In order to make the All-India Congress Committee an efficient body, the Constitution has provided for a Working Committee of fifteen, which must meet often and must be able to deal with all the matters delegated to it by the All-India Congress Committee. It is designed to exercise all the functions of the All-India Congress Committee, when the latter is not sitting. It must watch and guide public opinion, it must interpret it, it must keep all the subsidiary organisations in working order, it must attend to All-India finance, it must distribute it, and whenever decision on matters of grave importance has to be taken, it must summon a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee for direction. The Working Committee is to the Congress, what a Cabinet is to a Parliament. Its decisions must command respect, if we are to evolve constitutional government during this year. Naturally, therefore, its members must be those, who command the greatest respect of the All-India Congress Committee and of the nation. It dare not take any hasty decisions, and it must be a homogeneous body. It cannot have two policies or two parties within itself. Whilst the Congress represents the whole nation, and may therefore have every type and all parties, the Working Committee must consist of men representing the policy and the party, that have the confidence of the majority of the delegates. Its decisions have largely to be unanimous. When a member cannot pull on with

the rest, he can resign, but he may not obstruct or affect the deliberations of the Committee by an open discussion of its deliberations in the press. Whilst, therefore, the decisions of the Working Committee should be carried out by Congressmen, it is not an irresponsible body. It can be dismissed by the All-India Congress Committee by a vote of no confidence. Its decisions are subject to be reviewed by the All-India Congress Committee, and even set aside for grave reasons. In my humble opinion, unless the Working Committee carries weight with people, it is hardly possible to attain Swaraj during this year. Every one of us must, therefore, work to make the Congress an irresistible body by its resolutions being carried out in every little detail. What the Government does in the last resort by force of arms, the Congress expects to do by force of affection. 'The Government has rendered itself irresistible by striking terror in the hearts of the people, the Congress must make itself felt by securing the free-will acceptance of its doctrines and policies. Non-violence thus runs through everything connected with the people's programme. But each organisation expects to succeed by reason of people's co-operation. Loyalty to the Congress decisions is a *sine qua non* of success of the Nagpur determination to achieve Swaraj during the year.

MUSLIM REPRESENTATION

Several complaints have been received regarding the advisory resolution of the Working Committee about the Lucknow compact. The only section of the

new Constitution bearing on Muslim representation, is the one regarding the rights of minorities. As it was brought to the notice of the Working Committee, that Mussalmans were getting nervous about their representation and desired observance of the Lucknow compact in the Congress, it was thought advisable to give the guidance in that direction. Attempts are certainly being made to divide us. Mussalmans have only now begun to come in. And it is the duty of the Hindus to hold out every lawful inducement to them to join the Congress. It must be the common meeting ground for all races and religions. Where Mussalmans do not come forward at all in spite of entreaty, the seats can be left vacant for want of candidates, or filled in by others pending the appearance of suitable Muslim candidates. Some friends urge, that we should just now think not of special claims, but only of efficiency. Efficiency is undoubtedly admirable, but we can easily make of it a fetish as our English friends have done. Unity is more important than efficiency. Unity for us is efficiency. The only thing we may not sacrifice to unity, is principle or conscience, or which is the same thing, truth.

FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 9, 1922*)

I see that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the scope of foreign propaganda undertaken by

the Working Committee. I see that it was a mistake not to have published the report that was adopted by the Working Committee. Here it is:—

Bardoli, 22nd Feb. 1922.

To

The Chairman of the Working Committee
of the All-India Congress Committee, Delhi.

Sir,—At the meeting of the Working Committee held at Surat on 31st January last the following Resolution was passed:—

“The Working Committee records its firm conviction that dissemination of correct news about Indian political situation in foreign countries is absolutely essential and refers to Mahatma Gandhi all the correspondence on the subject of foreign propaganda now with the Working Secretary with a request that he should prepare a definite scheme in that behalf at an early date so as to enable the next meeting of the Working Committee to consider it.”

Having considered the resolution and the papers forwarded to me by the Secretary, I beg to report as follows:—

In my opinion it is not only undesirable but it may prove even harmful to establish at the present stage any agency in any foreign country for the dissemination of correct news in such country about the political situation in India, for the following reasons:—

First because it would distract public attention and instead of making the people feel that they have to rely purely on their own strength, it will make them think of the effect of their actions on foreign countries and the support the latter can render to the national cause. This

does not mean that we do not care for the world's support, but the way to gain that support is to insist upon the correctness of every one of our actions and rely upon the automatic capacity of Truth to spread itself.

Secondly, it is my experience that when an agency is established for any special purpose independent interest ceases to a certain extent and what is distributed by the agency is previously discounted as coming from interested quarters.

Thirdly, the Congress will not be able to exercise effective check over such agencies, and there is great danger of authoritative distribution of wrong information and wrong ideas about the struggle.

Fourthly, it is not possible at the present moment to send out of India any person of importance for the sole purpose of disseminating news in foreign countries for such men are too few for the internal work.

I am therefore of opinion that the work of publishing the Congress Bulletin should be better organised, if necessary, by engaging a special editor for the purpose and by sending the Congress Bulletin regularly to the chief news agencies of the world. The editor should be instructed to enter into correspondence with those newspapers of news agencies which may be found to interest themselves in Indian questions.

It is my firm opinion based upon experience joined through the conduct of the journals I have edited in South Africa and here that the more solid the Congress work and the sufferings of the Congressmen and women the greater the publicity will the cause attain without special effort. From the exchanges

of letters and correspondence that I receive day by day from all parts of the world in connection with the conduct of *Young India*, I observe that never was so much interest taken in Indian affairs throughout the world as it is to-day. It follows that the interest will increase in the same proportion as the volumes of our sufferings. The very best method of disseminating correct information about the political situation, therefore, is to make the Congress work purer, better organised and to evoke a grater spirit of suffering. Not only is curiosity thereby intensified, but people become more eager to understand the inwardness and the exact truth about the situation.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

(Sd.) M. K. Gandhi.

After having gone through all the papers that were given to me and after having heard all the arguments for and against, I remain convinced that at least for the present we want no news agency outside India. We want the whole world with us, but we shall not get it by carrying on a foreign agency. We can only send correct information to those who care for it. If a foreign country does not keep its own agency for gathering information from a particular country or about a particular movement, it is proof to me that that country is not interested in it. We have been without our agency in London now for nearly 15 months. I venture to think that we are no worse off to-day than we were 15 months ago. We are certainly better off because and to the extent that we have done

substantial work in India itself. There are more people in the world interested to-day in India than they ever were. We, therefore, owe it to them that we place at their disposal correct information, but our duty must end there. I have before me a letter from Italy from an Italian editor telling me how deeply interested people in Italy are in the Indian movement, and the Italian newspapers are therefore busy instructing the Italian public in Indian affairs. This is what I call a natural and organic movement, but if on the strength of this information we were to establish an Indian agency in Italy to awaken further interest, we would not mend matters but would spoil them by overdoing. We shall therefore better consult our own interest by relying upon our own strength to speak for itself.

Moreover, the non-co-operation movement is one of self-help. Its formula is 'We shall succeed only to the extent of our strength and no further.' No certificate of merit from the world will give us success, if we have not earned it by the sweat of the brow. No condemnation of the movement will kill it unless we are ourselves so fickle-hearted as to give it up by reason of the condemnation. Let us not therefore turn our attention from our own work. Let us simply mind our work and let us be sure that the world will mind us without any further effort. I am really jealous of even taking away from their work some of the young men who necessarily have to be engaged in the preparation and distribution of the Congress Bulletin. But we have really no authentic record of the progress of our work from week to week. The Congress Bulletin will therefore be useful

as well for workers in India, as it undoubtedly will be for our friends in foreign countries.

Being almost impatient to see the work inaugurated, the Working Committee has given me a free hand in organising the Bulletin. I hope to issue the first Bulletin next week and thenceforth it would be issued from week to week. The Bulletin will be sent to all the readers of *Young India* at a nominal charge to cover a part or the whole of the cost of paper and printing. *Young India* has a registered circulation of over 25,000 and it goes to almost all parts of the world. It has a comprehensive exchange list. The price for the subscribers to the Bulletin only will be announced later. The method I have sketched is intended to save the Congress as much expense as possible and to give the widest publicity to the Bulletin. Whereas *Young India* represents my own views and those of my associates in the conduct of the journal, the Bulletin will contain nothing in the shape of individual views. It will be mainly a record of Congress activities all over India in all its multifarious departments, and an epitome of newspaper opinions both pro-Congress and anti-Congress. It will contain a Khilafat section registering all Khilafat activities during the preceding week. Such a Bulletin cannot become a success unless there is co-operation from all Congress and Khilafat workers. I invite therefore all who are interested in the Bulletin to send their suggestions and news addressed to the Editor, *Congress Bulletin c/o Young India*. Correspondents will please take care to mark all such correspondence for the *Congress Bulletin* in order to save the *Young India* staff

from having to handle correspondence intended or the Bulletin. To start with, I would ask every Provincial Congress Committee to send the number of members on its provincial register, the number of village and district organisations, the names and addresses of nationalist newspapers, the number of national educational institutions with the average attendance during the past 6 months, the number of *panchayats* and all other information regarding non-co-operation activities.

CONGRESS FETISH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*March 2, 1921*)

We must avoid the Congress becoming a fetish. I love the idea of every body becoming a Congressman and everybody yielding willing and intelligent obedience to the Congress resolutions. But I abhor the idea of anybody becoming a Congressman merely because it is an old or a great institution or yielding obedience to its resolutions whether one likes it or no. The rule of majority has a narrow application, *i. e.*, one should yield to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable to the majority, no matter what its decisions are. Thus notwithstanding Congress resolution, it is wrong in my opinion to withdraw from councils or not to covet election thereto, if one believes that councils are even a tolerably good institution. It is similarly wrong for a lawyer to suspend practice

merely because the Congress says so. Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. I, therefore, believe that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority so long as it does not act in the name of the Congress. A practising lawyer may become a Congressman, he cannot be called a Non-co-operator, and cannot and should not, therefore, be on the All-India Congress Committee. Similarly one who does not wear hand-spun and handwoven *Khuldar* or a titleholder or a councillor may not be called "Non-co-operators" though all those may be Congressmen.

But not only do I think that a Congressman is not bound by the resolutions which he does not approve of, he is also entitled always to go beyond the Congress resolutions, provided that he does not violate the creed and if he does not act in the name of the Congress. Supposing that the restrictions put by the Congress do not suit a particular province, that that province has even voted against them, that that province finds that it can look after itself, it has every right to go forward and justify its rebellion by success. The Congress only finds the highest common factor, but it may conceivably be far short of the requirements of a particular province. That province may, if it has confidence and if it is not likely to jeopardise any Congress interest, certainly go on with its own programme on its own responsibility and at the risk of a vote of censure from the Congress. This, in my opinion, is what the spirit of democracy requires. What

and the Empire. He wanted immediate equality which he believed was his country's birthright. And in his struggle for India's freedom he did not spare the Government. In the battle for freedom he gave no quarter and asked for none. I hope that Englishmen will recognise the worth of the man whom India has adored.

For us, he will go down to the generations yet unborn as maker of modern India. They will revere his memory as of a man who lived for them and died for them. It is blasphemy to talk of such a man as dead. The permanent essence of him abides with us for ever. Let us erect for the only Lokamanya of India an imperishable monument by weaving into our own lives his bravery, his simplicity, his wonderful industry and his love of his country. May God grant his soul peace.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN

BY M. K. GANDHI

(November 12, 1919)

The appointment of the Commission of Inquiry in South Africa is indefinitely postponed. Meanwhile the relations between the South African Indian settlers and the European community continue to be strained and

embittered. Our countrymen there have lost all faith even in the Union Government, so much so that the latest *Indian Opinion* characterises them as a pack of "artful dodgers". In this atmosphere of hate and resentment, it is but meet that a man like Mr. Andrews so fitted to carry the message of love and hope and to help all to understand one another better should proceed to South Africa. That noble-hearted Englishman is doing his full share in the work of our national regeneration. If it is the honour of Indian womanhood in Fiji to be defended he is there. If wrong is to be remedied in the Punjab and succour given to the helpless and the needy he is there. If it is the Tamil labourers of Ceylon who require his services he gives them ungrudgingly and now when there is a call from South Africa he readily responds. The South African Ministers know him. Our countrymen have already felt the warmth of his affection in their hour of need and we doubt not that Mr. Andrews will be able to comfort them and to pave the way for the mission that is to proceed to South Africa on behalf of the Government of India and though the question bristles with difficulties with Mr. Andrews in South Africa we may safely hope for a worthy settlement.

THE MALAVIYAS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(*January 12, 1921*)

The most remarkable feature in the remarkable non-co-operation struggle is the fact that it has divided families. And of all such instances none is so striking as the division in the Malaviya family. It furnishes, in my opinion, an object-lesson to India in toleration and civil disobedience. Pandit Malaviyaji's toleration is really beyond compare. I know that he is against seeking imprisonment. I know, too, that if he believed in it, he is not the person to shirk it. I should not be surprised to find him when the agony has reached white heat and when his faith in British justice is completely gone like mine, to be the foremost in seeking imprisonment. But whilst he is himself against the course of civil disobedience for the present, he has never interfered with the choice of even those who are nearest to him and over whom he has unquestioned authority by right of love and eldership. On the contrary he has left even his own sons absolutely free to do as they please. To me the instance of Govind's civil disobedience is one to treasure. Panditji tried hard to wean that brave boy in his own gentle and sweet manner. Govind tried his very best to carry out what he knew to be his father's wish up to the last moment. He prayed for light. He was torn by conflict of duties. The arrests of the Nehrus proved too strong for the young man.

And invoking the blessings of his great and great-hearted father he decided to throw himself into the struggle, and the jails of India probably hold no more joyous heart than Govind Malaviya's. I make bold to say that he has by his act of civil disobedience proved as dutiful to his father as he has been dutiful to his country. Govind's act is a pattern for our time in dutiful civil disobedience of children. There is, I am sure, no gulf between father and son. Probably Malaviyaji is prouder of his son Govind now than he was before the latter's decision to seek imprisonment. It is truthful acts like these which prove to me the religious nature of the struggle. I cannot resist the temptation of quoting Govind's courageous statement before the court:—

“To the court before which I stand. That you sit here with foregone decision and judgment and that you are out with all your declining might not to punish offence but to stifle and to crush the legitimate national aspirations of a people, goes without saying. And as I do not, therefore, recognise your law I would not like to say a word to you. But just as you are out to crush us, so also we are out to prove to you, to yourselves and to the world at large, that the brute force of your Government is not a bit mightier than our weapon of war, the soul-force of 315 millions of people. And with this end in view, I want to tell you and through you the Government you here represent that arrests of humble workers like myself or even greater men will not stop our work. Surely,

you can impose any restrictions upon our physical bodies, but the soul within us and the determination which carries us on and upward S w a r a j are things beyond your or any other's control. Our spirit which inspires us and sends us willingly here to-day is not only ours, but our whole country shares it with us. By putting our material selves under imprisonment, you are only helping me and my countrymen in attaining nobler and great moral strength, and if you only be good enough to persist for some time more in the downward course you now pursue, I assure you and all others that it will not be long before we destroy the present system of government in our country and become free and happy men. And in the hope that you will do so and thus render us invaluable help, I offer you my and my countrymen's most sincere thanks. *Vande Mataram.*"

I invite the reader to join me in congratulating both the father and the son. The country has every reason to be proud of both, and where youths show the courage that Govind has shown, the result of the struggle is a certainty.

A CONFESSION OF FAITH

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 13, 1921)

A strange anonymous letter has been received by me, admiring me for having taken up a cause that was

dearest to Lokamanya's heart and telling me that his spirit was residing in me and that I must prove a worthy follower of his. The letter moreover admonishes me not to lose heart in the prosecution of the Swaraj programme and finishes off by accusing me of imposture in claiming to be politically a disciple of Gokhale. I wish correspondents will throw off the slavish habit of writing anonymously. We who are developing the Swaraj spirit must cultivate the courage of fearlessly speaking out our mind. The subject-matter of the letter however being of public importance demands a reply. I cannot claim the honour of being a follower of the late Lokamanya. I admire him like millions of his countrymen for his indomitable will, his vast learning, his love of country, and above all the purity of his private life and great sacrifice. Of all the men of modern times, he captivated most the imagination of his people. He breathed into us the spirit of Swaraj. No one perhaps realised the evil of the existing system of Government as Mr. Tilak did. And in all humility I claim to deliver his message to the country as truly as the best of his disciples. But I am conscious that my method is not Mr. Tilak's method. And that is why I have still difficulty with some of the Maharashtra leaders. But I sincerely think that Mr. Tilak did not disbelieve in my method. I enjoyed the privilege of his confidence. And his last word to me in the presence of several friends was just a fortnight before his death that mine was an excellent method if the people could be persuaded to take to it. But he said he had doubts. I know no other method. I can only hope that

when the final test comes, the country will be proved to have assimilated the method of non-violent non-co-operation. Nor am I unaware of my other limitations. I can lay no claim to scholarship. I have not his powers of organisation. I have no compact disciplined party to lead, and having been an exile for twenty-three years, I cannot claim the experience that the Lokamanya had of India. Two things we had in common to the fullest measure—love of country and the steady pursuit of Swaraj. I can, therefore, assure the anonymous writer that yielding to none in my reverence for the memory of the deceased, I will march side by side with the foremost of the Lokamanya's disciples in the pursuit of Swaraj. I know that the only offering acceptable to him is the quickest attainment of Swaraj by India. That and nothing else can give his spirit peace.

Discipleship, however, is a sacred personal matter. I fell at Dadabhai's feet in 1888, but he seemed to be too far away from me. I could be as son to him, not disciple. A disciple is more than a son. Discipleship is a second birth. It is a voluntary surrender. In 1896 I met almost all the known leaders of India in connection with my South African mission. Justice Ranade awed me. I could hardly talk in his presence. Badruddin Tayabji fathered me, and asked me to be guided by Ranade and Pherozeshah. The latter became a patron. His will had to be law. "You must address a public meeting on the 26th September, and you must be punctual." I obeyed. On the 25th evening I was to wait on him. I did.

"Have you written out your speech?" he inquired.

"No, sir."

"That won't do, young man. Can you write it out to-night?"

"Munshi, you must go to Mr. Gandhi and receive the manuscript from him. It must be printed over night and you must send me a copy." Turning to me, he added, "Gandhi, you must not write a long speech, you do not know Bombay audiences cannot stand long addresses." I bowed.

The lion of Bombay taught me to take orders. He did not make me his disciple. He did not even try.

I went thence to Poona. I was an utter stranger. My host first took me to Mr. Tilak. I met him surrounded by his companions. He listened, and said, "We must arrange a meeting for you. But perhaps you do not know, that we have unfortunately two parties. You must give us a non-party man as chairman. Will you see Dr. Bhandarkar?" I consented and retired. I have no firm impression of Mr. Tilak, except to recall that he shook off my nervousness by his affectionate familiarity. I went thence, I think, to Gokhale, and then to Dr. Bhandarkar. The latter greeted me as a teacher his pupil.

"You seem to be an earnest and enthusiastic young man. Many people do not come to see me at this the hottest part of the day. I never now-a-days attend public meetings. But you have recited such a pathetic story that I must make an exception in your favour."

I worshipped the venerable doctor with his wise face. But I could not find for him a place on that little throne. It was still unoccupied. I had many heroes but no king.

It was different with Gokhale, I cannot say why. I met him at his quarters on the college ground. It was like meeting an old friend, or better still a mother after a long separation. His gentle face put me at ease in a moment. His minute inquiries about myself and my doings in South Africa at once enshrined him at my heart. And as I parted from him, I said to myself, 'you are my man.' And from that moment Gokhale never lost sight of me. In 1901 on my second return from South Africa, we came closer still. He simply 'took me in hand,' and began to fashion me. He was concerned about how I spoke, dressed, walked and ate. My mother was not more solicitous about me than Gokhale. There was, as far as I am aware, no reserve between us. It was really a case of love at first sight, and it stood the severest strain in 1913. He seemed to me all I wanted as a political worker—pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and chivalrous to a fault. It does not matter to me, that he may not have been any of these things. It was enough for me, that I could discover no fault in him to cavil at. He was and remains for me the most perfect man on the political field. Not, therefore, that we had no differences. We differed even in 1901 in our views on social customs, *e. g.*, widow re-marriage. We discovered differences in our estimate of western civilisation. He frankly differed from me in my extreme views on non-violence. But these differences

mattered neither to him nor to me. Nothing could put us asunder. It were blasphemous to conjecture what would have happened if he were alive to-day. I know that I would have been working under him. I have made this confession, because the anonymous letter hurt me, when it accused me of imposture about my political discipleship. Had I been remiss in my acknowledgment to him who is now dumb? I thought, I must declare my faithfulness to Gokhale, especially when I seemed to be living in a camp which the Indian world calls opposite.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

BY M. K. GANDHI

(April 13, 1921)

There is a homely proverb in Gujarati which means, a noted banker continually adds to his wealth, as a notorious criminal continually comes in for undeserved blame. Whether I am to be regarded as a reformer or a criminal, the situations I find myself in are most curious and often embarrassing. The people credit me with supernatural powers when the only powers I have are derived from my scrupulous regard for truth, an unquenchable industry, fair play to opponents, readiness

always to admit mistakes, and an incessant appeal to reason. But the simple-minded masses will not believe me when I tell them I possess no extraordinary powers. Similarly those who are not accustomed to absolutely honest dealings in politics persist in crediting me with all kinds of wickednesses. The *Morning Post* believes that the strike in Fiji was due to the efforts of a Sadhu sent there by me. Now I do not know who the alleged Sadhu is. I have certainly sent no one to Fiji to advise a strike. At the same time the strike having been declared in Fiji, the strikers have my sympathy. All the evidence in my possession shows that Fiji is a huge exploitation camp in which the poor Indian labourers are used by the sugar-planters for their fabulous profits.

A MESSENGER OF GOD

BY M. K. GANDHI

(May 25, 1921)

I have received a cutting, in which I am reported to be credited with being a messenger of God, and I am asked whether I claim to have any special revelation from God. I have already dealt with the miracles attributed to me. As to this the latest charge, I must disown it. I pray like every good Hindu. I believe that we can all become messengers of God, if we cease to

fear man and seek only God's Truth, I do believe I am seeing only God's Truth and have lost all fear of man. I therefore do *feel* that God is with the movement of Non-co-operation. I have no special revelation of God's will. My firm belief is that He reveals himself daily to every human being but we shut our ears to the 'still small voice.' We shut our eyes to the Pillar of Fire in front of us. I *realise* His omnipresence. And it is open to the writer to do likewise.

BLASPHEMY

BY M. K. GANDHI

(July 13, 1921)

A correspondent writes:—I regret very much to inform you, that one constantly sees pictures in which you and other leaders have been represented as Shrikrishna and Pandavas, respectively. Will you not use your influence to stop this, as it must hurt the religious feelings of many like myself, who consider Srikrishna to have been not merely a great man but God incarnate? The correspondent has my fullest sympathy. I have not seen the pictures, but I hold it to be a blasphemy to represent me as Srikrishna. I claim to be a humble worker and no more among many in a great cause, which can only be injured rather than advanced by glorification of its leaders. A cause has the best chance

of success, when it is examined and followed on its own merits. Measures must always in a progressive society be held superior to men, who are after all imperfect instruments working for their fulfilment. I would therefore urge, with all the strength at my command enthusiasts or enterprising businessmen to observe some sense of proportion and withdraw all such pictures, which like the one under notice are undoubtedly calculated to wound deep religious susceptibilities.

MY AMBITION

BY M. K. GANDHI

(August 25, 1921)

A persistent correspondent from Simla asks me whether I intend to found a sect or claim divinity. I have answered him by a private letter. But he would have me make a public declaration for the sake of posterity. I should have thought that I had in the strongest terms repudiated all claim to divinity. I claim to be a humble servant of India and humanity and would like to die in the discharge of such service. I have no desire to found a sect. I am really too ambitious to be satisfied with a sect for a following for I represent no new Truths I endeavour to follow and represent truth as I know it. I do claim to throw a new light on many an old truth. I hope that this declaration will satisfy my inquirer and others like him.

THE GREAT TRIAL

[*The Trial of Mahatma Gandhi and Sjt Sankarlal Banker at the Government Circuit House, Ahmedabad, on Saturday, 18th March, 1922, before C. N. Broomsfield Esq., I. C. S., District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad.*]

The trial opened at 12 noon on Saturday, the 18th March, 1922. Hon. Sir. J. T. Strangman, Advocate-General, Bombay, assisted by A. C. Wild Esq., Legal Remembrancer to the Government of Bombay and Rao Bahadur Girdarilal, Public Prosecutor, conducted the prosecution.

The accused were undefended.

The Registrar of the Court read out the charges under S. 123-A, I. P. C., against Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Sankarlal Banker, and also the three articles—"TAMPERING WITH LOYALTY," "THE PUZZLE AND ITS SOLUTION," and "SHAKING THE MANES"—published in the *Young India* on 29th Sept. '21, 15th Decr. '21, and 23rd Feby. '22, respectively.

The Judge said that the law required that the charges not only be read out but explained. In this case it would not be necessary for him to say much by way of explanation. The charge in each case was that of bringing or attempting to bring into hatred or contempt or exciting or attempting to excite disaffection towards His Majesty's Government established by law in British India. Both the accused were charged with the three offences under section 124-A contained in the articles read out, written by Mr. Gandhi and printed by Mr. Banker.

The words hatred and contempt were words, the meaning of which was sufficiently obvious. The word disaffection was defined under the section and they were told that disaffection included disloyalty and of feelings of enmity and the word used in the section had also been interpreted by the High Court of Bombay in a reported case as meaning political alienation of discontent, a spirit of disloyalty to Government or existing authority.

The charges having been read out, the Judge called upon the accused to plead to the charge. He asked Mahatma Gandhi whether he pleaded guilty or claimed to be tried.

Mahatma Gandhi: I plead guilty to all the charges. I observe that the King's name has been omitted from the charges and it has been properly omitted.

The Judge: Mr. Banker, do you plead guilty or do you claim to be tried?

Mr. Banker:—I plead guilty.

ADVOCATE-GENERAL URGES TRIAL

Sir T. Strangman said under section 271, Criminal Procedure Code, it was open to the Judge to convict the accused on their pleas or to proceed with the trial. The section says: 'If the accused pleads guilty, the plea shall be regarded, and he *may* be convicted thereon'. The words were 'may', not 'must.' He asked his honour to proceed with the trial. In the first instance the charges were of a serious character and in the second place it was highly desirable in the public interest that those charges should be fully and thoroughly investigated. He did not think it was necessary to labour further. From a further and narrower point of view that was in regard to

the sentence it was obvious that the Judge could not deal with the accused unless he had the full facts of the case before him. That was the view taken by the Bombay High Court, (19 Bombay Law Reports, page 356). That was an extreme case. [The Advocate-General then read out the case to the Court and it was in regard to a murder charge in which the accused was sentenced to be hanged.] Those remarks applied to the case, said Sir T. Strangman, and he again quoted 23 Madras 151. It would be impossible to deal with the matter satisfactorily and also other matters which he would ask the Judge to take into account. On that ground also he would ask the Court to proceed with the trial.

COURT'S REPLY.

The Court said it could not agree with what had been said. He had full discretion to convict on the plea if he thought it proper to do so, and in this particular case nothing would be gained by going once more into the evidence recorded by the committing Magistrate. As regards the question of the charges they would be fully investigated and as far as he was aware nothing more was needed to establish the offence going to show that Mr. Gandhi was responsible for those particular articles. In the face of the plea it seemed to him that it would be futile to raise the point.

As regards the question of sentence it went without saying that from the time he knew that he was going to try the case, he had tried to consider the sentence and he was prepared to hear anything that the counsel might have to say or Mr. Gandhi wished to say on the sentence.

He honestly did not believe that the mere recording of evidence in the trial which counsel has asked for would make a difference to them one way or the other. He, therefore, proposed to accept the plea.

Mahatma Gandhi smiled at this decision.

The Judge said nothing further. It remained for him, no doubt, to pass the sentence, and before doing so he liked to hear Sir T. Strangman. He was entitled to base his general remarks on the charges against the accused and on their pleas.

ADVOCATE-GENERAL'S ARGUMENTS.

Sir T. Strangman : It will be difficult to do so. I ask the court that the whole matter may be properly considered. If I stated what has happened before the committing Magistrate, then I can show that there are many things which are material to the question of the sentence.

The first point, he said, he wanted to make out was that the matter which formed the subject of the present charges formed part of the campaign to spread disaffection openly and systematically, to render Government impossible and to overthrow it. The earliest article that was put in from *Young India* was dated 25th May, 1921, which said that it was the duty of a non-co-operator to create disaffection towards the Government. Counsel then read out portions of articles written by Mr. Gandhi in *Young India*.

Court said nevertheless it seemed to it that the court could accept a plea of the materials of which the sentence had to be based.

Sir T. Strangman said the question of sentence was entirely for the court to decide. The court was always

entitled to deal in a more general manner in regard to the question of the sentence than the particular matter resulting in the conviction. He asked leave to refer to articles before the court and what result might have been produced if the trial had proceeded, in order to ascertain what the facts were. He was not going into any matter which involved a dispute.

The Judge said there was not the least objection to his going into the charges in a general way.

Sir T. Strangman said he wanted to show that these articles were not isolated. They formed part of an organised campaign, but so far as *Young India* was concerned they would show that from the year 1921. Counsel then read out an extract from the paper, dated June 8, on the duty of a non-co-operator which was to preach disaffection towards the existing Government for preparing the country for civil disobedience. Then in the same number there was an article on "Disaffection, a Virtue," or something to that effect. Then there was an article on the 28th of July, 1921, in which it was stated that "we have to destroy the system." Again on September 30, 1921, there was an article headed "Punjab Prosecutions," where it was stated that a non-co-operator worthy of his name should preach disaffection. That was all so far as *Young India* was concerned. They were earlier in date than the article "Tampering with Loyalty" and it referred to the Governor of Bombay. Continuing, he said, the accused was a man of high educational qualifications, and evidently from his writings a recognised leader. The harm that was likely to be caused was considerable.

They were the writings of an educated man and not the writings of an obscure man and the court must consider to what the results of a campaign of the nature disclosed in the writings must inevitably lead. They had examples before them in the last few months. He referred to the occurrences in Bombay last November and Chauri-Chaura leading to murder and destruction of property, involving many people in misery and misfortune. It was true that in the course of those articles they would find non-violence was insisted upon as an item of the campaign and as an item of the creed. But what was the use of preaching non-violence when he preached disaffection towards Government or openly instigated others to overthrow it? The answer to that question appeared to them to come from Chauri-Chaura, Madras and Bombay. These were circumstances which he asked the court to take into account in sentencing the accused, and it would be for the court to consider those circumstances which must involve sentences of severity.

As regards the second accused his offence was lesser. He did the publication and he did not write. His offence nevertheless was a serious one. His instructions were that he was a man of means and he asked the court to impose a substantial fine in addition to such term of imprisonment as might be inflicted upon. He quoted section 10 of the Press Act as bearing on the question of fine. When making a declaration, he said, a deposit of Rs. 1,000 to 10,000 was asked in many cases.

Court : Mr. Gandhi, do you wish to make a statement on the question of sentence ?

Mahatma Gandhi : I would like to make a statement.

Court : Could you give it to me in writing to put it on record ?

Mahatma Gandhi : I shall give it as soon as I finish reading it.

MR. GANDHI'S ORAL STATEMENT

Before reading his written statement Mahatma Gandhi spoke a few words as introductory remarks to the whole statement. He said : Before I read this statement, I would like to state that I entirely endorsed the learned Advocate-General's remarks in connection with my humble self. I think that he was entirely fair to me in all the statements that he has made, because it is very true and I have no desire whatsoever to conceal from this Court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me. And the learned Advocate-General is also entirely in the right when he says that my preaching of disaffection did not commence with my connection with *Young India* but that it commenced much earlier and in the statement that I am about to read it will be my painful duty to admit before this Court that it commenced much earlier than the period stated by the Advocate-General. It is the most painful duty with me but I have to discharge that duty knowing the responsibility that rested upon my shoulders.

And I wish to endorse all the blame that the Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay occurrence, Madras occurrences, and the Chauri Chaura occurrences thinking over these things

deeply, and sleeping over them night after night and examining my heart, I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible for me to disassociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chauri Chaura or the mad outrages of Bombay. He is quite right when he says that as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of education, having had a fair share of experience of this world, I should know the consequence of every one of my acts. I knew them. I knew that I was playing with fire. I ran the risk and if I was set free, I would still do the same. I would be failing in my duty if I do not do so. I have felt it this morning that I would have failed in my duty if I did not say all what I said here just now. I wanted to avoid violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the last article of my faith. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered has done an irreparable harm to my country or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it; and I am, therefore, here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, Mr. Judge, is, as I am just going to say in my statement, either to resign your post or inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to ad-

minister are good for the people. I do not expect that kind of conversion. But by the time I have finished with my statement you will, perhaps, have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

MR. BANKER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Shankarlal Banker made the following statement:—

I only want to say that I had the privilege of printing these articles and I plead guilty to the charge. I have got nothing to say as regards the sentence.

MR. GANDHI'S WRITTEN STATEMENT

I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the public in England to placate which this prosecution is mainly taken up that I should explain why from a staunch loyalist and co-operator I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-co-operator. To the court too I should say why I plead guilty to the charge of promoting disaffection towards the Government established by law in India.

My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled weather. My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian I had no rights. On the contrary I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian.

But I was not baffled. I thought that this treatment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the Government

my voluntary and hearty co-operation, criticising it in full where I felt it was faulty but never wishing its destruction.

Consequently when the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906 at the time of the Zulu revolt I raised a stretcher-bearer party and served till the end of the 'rebellion'. On both these occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in despatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany I raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly in India when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1917 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen.

The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act, a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and culminating in crow-

ling orders, public floggings and other indescribable humiliations. I discovered too that the plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussalmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled. But in spite of the foreboding and the grave warnings of friends, at the Amritsar Congress in 1919 I fought for co-operation and working the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussalmans, that the Punjab wound would be healed and that the reforms inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India.

But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was whitewashed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue, and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw too that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude.

I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations before she can achieve the Dominion status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent India spun and wove in her millions of cottages

just the supplement she needed for adding to her meagre agricultural resources. The cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of Indians are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realise that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history. The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. My unbiassed examination of the Punjab Martial Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent. of convictions were wholly bad. My experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion that in nine out of every ten the condemned men were totally innocent. Their crime consisted in love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of hundred justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the Court of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion the administration of the law

is thus prostituted consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter.

The greatest misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many English and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world and that India is making steady though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organised display of force on the one hand and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other have emasculated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators. Section 124-A under which I am happily charged is perhaps the prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen. Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has no affection for a person or thing one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection so long as he does not contemplate, promote or incite to violence. But the section under which Mr. Banker and I are charged is one under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it, and I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege therefore to be charged under it. I have endeavoured to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal ill-will against any

single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system. India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before, Holding such a belief I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system. And it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles tendered in evidence against me.

In fact I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing in non-co-operation the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living. In my humble opinion, non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge and the Assessors, is either to resign your posts and thus dissociate yourselves from evil if you feel that the law you are called to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent, or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system

and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal.

THE JUDGMENT

The following is the full text of the judgment :—

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains namely, the determination of a just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face. The law is no respecter of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that in the eyes of millions of your countrymen you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and of even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticise you in any other character. It is my duty to judge you as a man subject to the law who has by his own admission broken the law and committed, what to an ordinary man must appear to be grave offences against the State. I do not forget that you have consistently preached against violence and that you have on many occasions, as I am willing to believe, done much to prevent violence. But having regard to the nature of political teaching and the nature of many of those to whom it was addressed, how you could have continued to believe that

violence would not be the inevitable consequence, it passes my capacity to understand. There are probably few people in India who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any Government to leave you at liberty. But it is so. I am trying to balance what is due to you against what appears to me to be necessary in the interest of the public, and I propose in passing sentence to follow the precedent of a case in many respects similar to this case that was decided some twelve years ago. I mean the case against Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak under the same section. The sentence that was passed upon him as it finally stood was a sentence of simple imprisonment for six years. You will not consider it unreasonable, I think, that you should be classed with Mr. Tilak. That is a sentence of two years' simple imprisonment on each count of the charge, six years in all which I feel it my duty to pass upon you; and I should like to say in doing so that if the course of events in India should make it possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you no one will be better pleased than I.

The Judge, then, addressing to Mr. Banker, said:—

I assume you have been to a large extent under the influence of your chief. The sentence that I propose to pass upon you is simple imprisonment for six months each of the first two counts, that is to say, simple imprisonment for one year, and a fine of thousand rupees on the third count with six months' simple imprisonment in default.

MR. GANDHI'S REPLY

Mahatma Gandhi said:—I would say one word since you have done me the honour of recalling the trial of the late

Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. I just want to say that I consider it to be the proudest privilege and honour to be associated with his name. So far as the sentence itself is concerned I certainly consider that it is as light as any judge would inflict on me and so far as the whole proceedings are concerned I must say that I could not have expected greater courtesy.

APPENDIX

[The following are the three articles published in "Young India" for which Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Banker were charged]

(A) TAMPERING WITH LOYALTY

BY M. K. GANDHI

HIS Excellency the Governor of Bombay had warned the public some-time ago, that he 'meant business', that he was not going to tolerate the speeches that were being made. In his note on the Ali Brothers and others he has made clear his meaning. The Ali Brothers are to be charged with having tampered with the loyalty of the sepoy and with having uttered sedition. I must confess, that I was not prepared for the revelation of such hopeless ignorance on the part of the Governor of Bombay. It is evident that he has not followed the course of Indian History during the past twelve months. He evidently does not know, that the National Congress began to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoy in September last year, that the Central Khilafat Committee began it earlier still, for I must be permitted to take the credit or the odium of suggesting, that India had a right openly to tell the sepoy and everyone who served the Government in any capacity whatsoever, that he participated in the wrongs done by the Government. The Conference at Karachi merely repeated the Congress declaration in terms of Islam, but speaking for Hinduism and speaking for nationalism I have no hesitation in saying, that it is sinful for anyone, either as soldier or civilian, to serve this Government which has proved treacherous to the Mussalmans of India and which had been guilty of the inhumanities of the Panjab. I have said this from many a platform in the presence of sepoys. And I if have not asked individual sepoys to come out, it has not been due to want of will but of ability to support them. I have not hesitated to tell the sepoy, that if he could leave the service and support himself without the Congress or the Khilafat aid, he should leave at once. And I promise, that as soon as the spinning wheel finds an abiding place in every home and Indians begin to feel that weaving gives anybody any day an honourable livelihood, I

shall not hesitate, at the peril of being shot to ask the Indian sepoy individually to leave his service and become a weaver. For, has not the sepoy been used to hold India under subjection, has he not been used to murder innocent people at Jalliharwala Pagh, has he not been used to drive away innocent men, women and children during that dreadful night at Chandpur, has he not been used to subjugate the proud Arab of Mesopotamia, has he not been utilised to crush the Egyptians? How can any Indian having a spark of humanity in him and any Mussalman having any pride in his religion feel otherwise than as the Ah Brothers have done? The sepoy has been used more often as a hired assassin than as a soldier defending the liberty or the honour of the weak and the helpless. The Governor has pandered to the basest in us by telling us what would have happened in Malabar but for the British soldier or sepoy. I venture to inform His Excellency, that Malabar Hindus would have fared better without the British bayonet, that Hindus and Mussalmans would have jointly appeased the Moplahs that possibly there being no Khilafat question there would have been no Moplah riot at all, that at the worst supposing that Mussalmans had common cause with the Moplahs, Hinduism would have relied upon its creed of non-violence and turned every Mussalman into a friend, or Hindu valour would have been tested and tried. The Governor of Bombay has done a disservice to himself and his cause (whatever it might be), by fomenting Hindu Mussalman disunion, and has insulted the Hindus, by letting them infer from his note, that Hindus are helpless creatures unable to die for or defend their hearth, home or religion. If however the Governor is right in his assumptions, the sooner the Hindus die out, the better for humanity. But let me remind His Excellency, that he has pronounced the greatest condemnation upon British rule, in that it finds Indians to-day devoid of enough manliness to defend themselves against looters, whether they are Moplahs, Mussalmans or infuriated Hindu of Arrah.

His Excellency's reference to the sedition of Ah Brothers is only less pardonable than his reference to the tampering. For he must know, that sedition has become the creed of the Congress. Every non-co-operator is pledged to preach disaffection towards the Government established by law. Non-co-operation, though a religious and strictly moral movement, deliberately aims at the overthrow of the Government, and is therefore legally seditious in terms of the Indian Penal Code. But this is no

new discovery. Lord Chelmsford knew it, Lord Reading knows it. It is unthinkable that the Governor of Bombay does not know it. It was common cause that so long as the movement remained non-violent, nothing would be done to interfere with it.

But it may be urged, that the Government has a right to change its policy when it finds, that the movement is really threatening its very existence as a system. I do not deny its right. I object to the Governor's note, because it is so worded as to let the unknowing public think, that tampering with the loyalty of the sepoy and sedition were fresh crimes committed by the Ali Brothers and brought for the first time to His Excellency's notice.

However the duty of the Congress and Khilafat workers is clear. We ask for no quarter, we expect none from the Government, we did not solicit the promise of immunity from prison so long as we remained non-violent. We may not now complain, if we are imprisoned for sedition. Therefore our self-respect and our pledge require us to remain calm, unperturbed and non-violent. We have our appointed course to follow. We must reiterate from a thousand platforms the formula of the Ali Brothers regarding the sepoys, and we must spread disaffection openly and systematically till it pleases the Government to arrest us. And this we do, not by way of angry retaliation, but because it is our *Dharma*. We must wear *Khadi* even as the Brothers have worn it, and spread the Gospel of Swadeshi. The Mussalmans must collect for Smyrna relief and the Angora Government. We must spread like the Ali Brothers the Gospel of Hindu—Muslim Unity and of non-violence for the purpose of attaining Swaraj and the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs.

We have almost reached the crisis. It is well with a patient who survives a crisis. If on the one hand we remain firm as a rock in the presence of danger, and on the other observe the greatest self-restraint, we shall certainly attain our end this very year.

Young India, September 29, 1921.

(B) A PUZZLE AND ITS SOLUTION

BY M. K. GANDHI

Lord Reading is puzzled and perplexed. Speaking in reply to the addresses from the British Indian Association and the Bengal National

Chamber of Commerce at Calcutta, His Excellency said, "I confess that when I contemplate the activities of a section of the community, I find myself still, notwithstanding persistent study ever since I have been in India, puzzled and perplexed. I ask myself what purpose is served by flagrant breaches of the law for the purpose of challenging the Government and in order to compel arrest?" The answer was partly given by Pandit Motilal Nehru when he said on being arrested that he was being taken to the house of freedom. We seek arrest because the so-called freedom is slavery. We are challenging the might of this Government because we consider its activity to be wholly evil. We want to overthrow the Government. We want to *compel* its submission to the people's will. We desire to show that the Government exists to serve the people, not the people the Government. Free life under the Government has become intolerable, for the price exacted for the retention of freedom is unconscionably great. Whether we are one or many, we must refuse to purchase freedom at the cost of our self-respect or our cherished convictions. I have known even little children become unbending when an attempt has been made to cross their declared purpose, be it ever so flimsy in the estimation of their parents.

Lord Reading must clearly understand that the non-co-operators are at war with the Government. They have declared rebellion against it in as much as it has committed a breach of faith with the Mussalmans, it has humiliated the Punjab and it insists upon imposing its will upon the people and refuses to repair the breach and repent of the wrong done in the Punjab.

There were two ways open to the people, the way of armed rebellion and the way of peaceful revolt. Non-co operators have chosen, some out of weakness, some out of strength, the way of peace, *i. e.*, voluntary suffering.

If the people are behind the sufferers, the Government must yield or be overthrown. If the people are not with them they have at least the satisfaction of not having sold their freedom. In an armed conflict the more violent is generally the victor. The way of peace and suffering is the quickest method of cultivating public opinion, and therefore when victory is attained it is for what the world regards as Truth. Bred in the atmosphere of law courts, Lord Reading finds it difficult to appreciate the peaceful resistance to authority. His Excellency will learn by the

time the conflict is over that there is a higher court, than courts of justice and that is the court of conscience. It supersedes all other courts.

Lord Reading is welcome to treat all the sufferers as lunatics, who do not know their own interest. He is entitled therefore to put them out of harm's way. It is an arrangement that entirely suits the lunatics and it is an ideal situation if it also suits the Government. He will have cause to complain if having courted imprisonment, non-co-operators fret and fume or 'whine for favours' as Lalaji puts it. The strength of a non-co-operator lies in his going to gaol uncomplainingly. He loses his case if having courted imprisonment he begins to grumble immediately his courtship is rewarded.

The threats used by This Excellency are unbecoming. This is a fight to the finish. It is a conflict between the reign of violence and of public opinion. Those who are fighting for the latter are determined to submit to any violence rather than surrender their opinion. (Dec. 15, 1921)

(C) SHAKING THE MANES

BY M. K. GANDHI

How can there be any compromise whilst the British Lion continues to shake his gory claws in our faces? Lord Birkenhead reminds us that Britain has lost none of her hard fibre. Mr. Montagu tells us in the plainest language that the British are the most determined nation in the world, who will brook no interference with their purpose. Let me quote the exact words telegraphed by Reuter —

"If the existence of our Empire were challenged, the discharge of responsibilities of the British Government to India prevented and demands were made in the very mistaken belief that we contemplated retreat from India—then India would not challenge with success the most determined people in the world, who would once again answer the challenge with all the vigour and determination at its command".

Both Lord Birkenhead and Mr. Montagu little know that India is prepared for all the hard fibre that can be transported across the seas and that her challenge was issued in the September of 1920 at Calcutta that India would be satisfied with nothing less than Swaraj and full redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. This does involve the existence of

the 'Empire' and if the present custodians of the British Empire are not satisfied with its quiet transformation into a true Commonwealth of free nations, each with equal rights and each having the power to secede at will from an honourable and friendly partnership, all the determination and vigour of 'the most determined people in the world' and the 'hard fibre' will have to be spent in India in a vain effort to crush the spirit that has risen and that will neither bend nor break. It is true that we have no 'hard fibre'. The rice-eating, puny millions of India seem to have resolved upon achieving their own destiny without any further tutelage and without arms. In the Lokamanya's language it is their 'birthright', and they will have it in spite of the 'hard fibre' and in spite of the vigour and determination with which it may be administered. India cannot and will not answer this insolence with insolence, but if she remains true to her pledge, her prayer to God to be delivered from such a scourge will certainly not go in vain. No empire intoxicated with red wine of power and plunder of weaker races has yet lived long in this world and this British Empire, which is based upon organised exploitation of physically weaker races of the earth and upon a continuous exhibition of brute force, cannot live if there is a just God ruling the universe. Little do these so-called representatives of the British nation realise that India has already given many of her best men to be dealt with by the British 'hard fibre'. Had Chauri Chaura not interrupted the even course of the national sacrifice, there would have been still greater and more delectable offerings placed before the Lion, but God had willed it otherwise. There is nothing, however, to prevent all those representatives in Downing Street and Whitehall from doing their worst. I am aware that I have written strongly about the insolent threat that has come from across the seas, but it is high time that the British people were made to realise that the fight that was commenced in 1920 is a fight to the finish, whether it lasts one month or one year or many months or many years and whether the representatives of Britain re-enact all the indescribable crimes of the Mutiny days with redoubled force or whether they do not. I shall only hope and pray that God will give India sufficient humility and sufficient strength to remain non-violent to the end. Submission to the insolent challenges that are cabled out on due occasions is now an utter impossibility. (Feb. 23, 1922.)